

## Supreme Court's Power to Overrule Itself

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- Three land acquisition cases have brought a constitutional question involving the powers of a SC bench to overturn previous verdicts.

\n

- The core contention involves whether a 3 member bench of the Supreme Court can overrule another 3 member bench's order.

\n

\n\n

### What was the Pune Municipal Corporation (PMC) case?

\n\n

\n

- "PMC & Ars vs Harakchand Solanki case" was related to proceedings for acquisition of 43.94 acres for the development of a "Forest Garden".

\n

- The landowners challenged the acquisition proceedings before the Bombay High Court, which ruled in their favour.

\n

- Subsequently, a 3 member bench of the Supreme Court upheld the High court order, in **January 2014**.

\n

- This was with reference to the "Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013".

\n

\n\n

### What was Indore Development Authority Case?

\n\n

\n

- **High Court ruling** - Indore Development Authority (IDA), wanted to acquire land for the construction of a link road on the outskirts of Indore city.

\n

- While IDA had deposited the compensation with the Land Acquisition Collector, the landowners simply refused to take it and approached the HC.

\n

- Madhya Pradesh High Court ruled that the claimants had **not received** compensation and the acquisition has hence lapsed.

\n

- This ruling was with the citation of the 2014 SC judgement in the PMC case.

\n

- **The Appeal** - Indore Development Authority (IDA) proceeded with an appeal against the Madhya Pradesh HC order to the Supreme Court.

\n

- This time, a 3 member bench, overturned the High Court order and unanimously ruled in favour of IDA's claim.

\n

- The Bench observed that once the amount of compensation had been unconditionally tendered, it would imply that payment has been made.

\n

- Hence, claimants/landowners who've refused compensation can't approach the court with the view that they've not been compensated.

\n

- Further, it stated that the previous SC decision in the 2014 PMC case was not correct and that it could be reviewed in future through appropriate cases.

\n

\n\n

## **What was the Haryana Land Acquisition case?**

\n\n

\n

- Haryana had acquired land belonging to G.D.Goenka Tourism Corporation Ltd and others in 2003.

\n

- A case in regard was filed in the Punjab and Haryana High Court in 2016, by those whose land had been acquired.

\n

- The High Court found that compensation was never paid to the parties, and held that the land acquisition proceedings were deemed to have lapsed.

\n

- Haryana government appealed against this ruling in the Supreme Court, which can be heard recently (Feb 21<sup>st</sup> 2018).

\n

\n\n

\n

- **The problem** - The Bench that is hearing the Haryana government's appeal, was informed of the Feb 8<sup>th</sup> IDA Case ruling.

\n

- This left the bench wondering on how a three-judge Bench could overturn the 2014 decision, which too, had been delivered by a three-judge Bench.

\n

- The bench has hence requested all HCs and other SC benches to defer their proceeding in cases that will be impacted by the Feb 8<sup>th</sup> order.

\n

- This has virtually stayed the operation of the February 8 order until a decision on whether to refer this issue to a larger bench is taken.

\n

- The current position is that any subsequent SC bench can overrule a previous SC bench order only when the number of judges in the latter is more.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Indian Express**

\n

