

The background of the journal cover features a top-down view of a desk. On the left, a pair of black leather brogue shoes is partially visible. In the center, an open notebook with lined pages and a silver pen lies on a light-colored wooden surface. To the right, a black leather bag with a zipper and a black leather watch with a silver face are also on the desk. A large, semi-transparent white rectangular box is centered over the image, containing the journal's title and ISSN information.

INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

"LAND ACQUISITION LAW IN INDIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPMENT, COMPENSATION, AND LANDOWNERS' RIGHTS"

AUTHOR BY - MONISH Y

VELS INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & ADVANCED STUDIES, SCHOOL OF LAW, PALLAVARAM, CHENNAI

CO-AUTHOR - SRIVINITHRA

Assistant Professor, School of Law

VELS INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & ADVANCED STUDIES, SCHOOL OF LAW, PALLAVARAM, CHENNAI

ABSTRACT

Land acquisition in India has long been a subject of legal, social, and economic debate, particularly due to the tension between developmental needs and the protection of individual property rights. Historically governed by the colonial Land Acquisition Act, 1894,¹ the acquisition process was often criticised for its imperial character, lack of transparency, inadequate compensation, and absence of meaningful rehabilitation. The broad interpretation of 'public purpose' and the wide discretionary powers of the State frequently produced arbitrary acquisitions, displacement, and livelihood loss. The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (LARR Act)² was enacted as a comprehensive reform addressing these shortcomings, introducing mandatory Social Impact Assessment, enhanced compensation, consent requirements for certain projects, and a structured rehabilitation framework. This article critically examines the evolution of land acquisition law in India through three interconnected lenses—the constitutional position of the right to property under Article 300A,³ the comparative shift from the 1894 Act to the 2013 Act, and the gap between legislative ambition and ground-level implementation. It concludes that although the LARR Act represents a progressive and necessary reform, its substantive promise remains incomplete in the absence of stronger institutional accountability and meaningful participation by affected communities.

Keywords: Land Acquisition, LARR Act 2013, Right to Property, Article 300A, Public Purpose, Compensation, Rehabilitation and Resettlement, Social Impact Assessment, Eminent Domain, Landowners' Rights, Displacement, Livelihood.

1. INTRODUCTION

Land in India is not merely a physical resource but a vital element that sustains human existence, economic development, and social identity. A large section of the population depends directly or indirectly on land for survival—through agriculture, pastoral practices, forest-based livelihoods, and traditional occupations—making it a particularly sensitive subject in governance and law. The relationship between the State and landowners has, however, undergone significant transformation over the past two centuries. During the colonial period, laws such as the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 were introduced primarily to serve administrative and imperial interests, empowering the State to acquire private land for 'public purposes' with minimal procedural safeguards for affected individuals.

After independence, India retained this colonial framework. Land acquisition was considered essential for nation-building—dams, highways, industrial corridors, and urban expansion all required land—and the State continued to exercise its inherent power of eminent domain. Yet the adverse effects of large-scale acquisitions soon became visible: displacement, loss of livelihood, inadequate compensation, and the absence of any meaningful rehabilitation produced sustained social unrest. Judicial interventions and constitutional amendments progressively shaped the discourse on land rights. The transformation of the right to property from a fundamental right under Article 31 to a constitutional right under Article 300A reflected a deliberate balancing of individual entitlements against collective developmental goals. Courts repeatedly emphasised that although the State had the power to acquire land, such power must be exercised in a fair, just, and reasonable manner.

In response to growing demands for reform, Parliament enacted the LARR Act in 2013. This legislation marked a significant departure by introducing transparency, public participation, mandatory Social Impact Assessment, enhanced compensation, and structured rehabilitation. It sought to strike a balance between developmental imperatives and the protection of landowners and affected communities. Despite these advances, several challenges remain in practical application. This article critically examines the legal framework through three principal lenses—constitutional foundations, comparative legislative evolution, and implementation gaps—and offers normative suggestions for reform. The discussion proceeds in seven parts: historical evolution (Part 2); the constitutional foundation of property rights

(Part 3); public purpose and Social Impact Assessment (Part 4); procedural framework and compensation (Part 5); rehabilitation and resettlement (Part 6); and conclusion with recommendations (Part 7).

2. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF LAND ACQUISITION LAW IN INDIA

2.1 Colonial Origins: The Bengal Regulation of 1824 and the 1894 Act

The systematic legal regulation of land acquisition in India traces its origins to the Bengal Regulation I of 1824,⁴ which authorised the acquisition of private land for public works such as roads, canals, and the construction of buildings for government use. Successive enactments in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies followed comparable patterns, culminating in the consolidating Land Acquisition Act of 1894. The 1894 Act became the principal instrument governing acquisition for over a century. Its central provisions—preliminary notification under section 4, declaration under section 6, notice under section 9, and award under section 11—established a procedural skeleton that, while ostensibly orderly, conferred sweeping discretion on the executive.⁵ The Act's broad and undefined conception of 'public purpose', the absence of any obligation to consult or rehabilitate displaced persons, and a compensation methodology tied to limited and often outdated valuations made it a pre-eminent instrument of imperial extraction rather than a balanced tool for equitable development.

2.2 Post-Independence Continuity and Constitutional Tensions

After independence, the new Indian State retained the 1894 framework with only marginal modifications. The drafters of the Constitution recognised the right to property as a fundamental right under Articles 19(1)(f) and 31, balancing individual ownership against the State's power to acquire for public purposes.⁶ Early constitutional jurisprudence engaged seriously with this tension. In *State of Bihar v. Kameshwar Singh*, the Supreme Court adjudicated on zamindari abolition and articulated the principle that compensation must be fair and just.⁷ Subsequent zamindari-abolition and bank-nationalisation litigation deepened the contest between the State's developmental ambitions and the property rights of individuals.

2.3 The 44th Amendment and the Rise of Article 300A

The constitutional position of property rights underwent a fundamental shift with the Constitution (Forty-Fourth Amendment) Act, 1978,⁸ which deleted the right to property from the Fundamental Rights chapter and inserted Article 300A in Part XII as a constitutional, but no longer fundamental, right. The provision states simply that 'no person shall be deprived of

his property save by authority of law.' The shift was not merely semantic. It permitted the Parliament greater flexibility in framing acquisition legislation while preserving for the citizen a procedural guarantee of legality. The Supreme Court in *K.T. Plantation Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka* affirmed that although Article 300A is not a fundamental right, the State's power to deprive a person of property must satisfy the requirements of legality, public purpose, and the absence of arbitrariness.⁹ In *Jilubhai Nanbhai Khachar v. State of Gujarat*, the Court emphasised that 'authority of law' contemplates a valid statute and that mere executive action cannot satisfy the constitutional standard.¹⁰

2.4 The Need for Reform and the Transition to LARR

By the late twentieth century, the deficiencies of the 1894 Act had become starkly visible. Mass displacements—particularly those associated with large dams, industrial corridors, and special economic zones—generated sustained civil society protest. The compensation under the 1894 Act, calculated on circle rates frequently divorced from actual market value, deepened economic distress. The absence of any statutory obligation of rehabilitation meant that displaced persons routinely lost not just their land but their entire economic, social, and cultural moorings. Recognition of this crisis led, after multiple legislative attempts, to the enactment of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

3. THE CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATION OF PROPERTY RIGHTS

3.1 Article 300A: A Constitutional Right with Procedural Bite

Article 300A reads: 'No person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of law.' Although demoted from its earlier status as a fundamental right, the provision retains substantial constitutional content. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the requirement of 'authority of law' is not merely formal: the law must be valid, the procedure must be fair, and the deprivation must serve a legitimate public purpose with adequate compensation. In *Bernard Francis Joseph Vaz v. State of Goa*, the Court emphasised that compulsory acquisition without compliance with statutory safeguards offends Article 300A.¹⁴ More recently, in *Kolkata Municipal Corporation v. Bimal Kumar Shah* (2024), the Court enumerated the constitutional incidents of Article 300A, articulating procedural and substantive guarantees that any deprivation of property must satisfy.¹³

3.2 The Doctrine of Eminent Domain

The doctrine of eminent domain—the inherent sovereign power to acquire private property for public use—operates as the conceptual foundation of all acquisition law. The doctrine is, however, subject to two universally recognised limitations: the acquisition must serve a public purpose, and the deprivation must be accompanied by compensation. The Indian Supreme Court in *R.C. Cooper v. Union of India*¹¹ and subsequently in *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*¹² articulated the principle that compensation must be a 'just equivalent' for the property taken, even though the precise judicial formulations have varied across the constitutional cycles. The eminent domain doctrine, in its post-Article 300A avatar, must be exercised consistently with the constitutional commitment to fairness, non-arbitrariness, and proportionality.

3.3 Public Purpose, Compensation, and Rehabilitation as Constitutional Concerns

Three substantive concerns converge on the modern doctrine of acquisition. *First*, public purpose has expanded over the decades from narrow infrastructural uses to encompass urbanisation, industrialisation, public-private partnerships, and even private-developer projects with public benefit. This expansion, while pragmatically necessary, raises serious questions about the substantive content of the constitutional limitation. *Second*, compensation has shifted from a formalist 'market value' framework under the 1894 Act to a substantive 'fair compensation' regime under the LARR Act, recognising solatium, multiplication factors, and damages. *Third*, rehabilitation has emerged as a constitutional concern in its own right. Scholars have rightly argued that the right to rehabilitation is a logical corollary of Article 300A, since the deprivation of land without restoration of livelihood is, in substance, a partial rather than a complete compensation.³⁴

4. PUBLIC PURPOSE AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 The Concept of Public Purpose under the LARR Act

Section 2(1) of the LARR Act enumerates the categories of acquisition for which the Act applies: strategic purposes relating to the armed forces; infrastructure projects; agro-processing and warehousing of agricultural produce; affordable housing; planned development of villages; and projects for residential purposes for the poor or landless or persons displaced by natural calamities.¹⁵ The list is at once narrower and broader than the 1894 conception: narrower in that it is enumerated rather than open-textured, broader in that it expressly includes private and public-private partnership projects subject to the consent thresholds in section 2(2)—80 per

cent for purely private projects and 70 per cent for public-private partnerships.¹⁷ The consent requirement is one of the LARR Act's most distinctive innovations, recognising that affected persons must have a substantive role in projects undertaken on their land.

4.2 Social Impact Assessment: Sections 4–9

The Social Impact Assessment regime under sections 4 to 9 represents the LARR Act's most ambitious procedural innovation.¹⁶ Before any acquisition, the appropriate Government must consult the concerned Gram Sabha or Municipality, conduct an SIA study, and publish the report. The study must consider whether the proposed acquisition serves a public purpose, the nature and extent of social impact on affected families, and whether the public benefit outweighs the social costs. A multi-disciplinary Expert Group then reviews the SIA report. The procedure is intended to embed deliberative legitimacy into the acquisition process and to operationalise the constitutional commitment to fair, non-arbitrary deprivation. In practice, however, SIA reports are frequently produced as formalities rather than substantive evaluations, and Expert Group recommendations are often disregarded—a gap to which Part 7 returns.

4.3 Public Hearings, Participation, and Transparency

Beyond the SIA, the LARR Act mandates public hearings, prior intimation, and the publication of all material documents in the local language. The transparency provisions of the Act stand in marked contrast to the 1894 regime's almost ritualistic notice procedures. Affected persons have the right to participate, raise objections under section 15, and seek written reasons for adverse determinations. The participatory architecture aspires to convert acquisition from a top-down administrative imposition into a deliberative process. Empirical studies, however, document repeated instances of consultations conducted as formalities, gram-sabha resolutions ignored, and consent figures inflated through procedural shortcuts.³⁵

5. PROCEDURE FOR ACQUISITION AND THE RIGHT TO FAIR COMPENSATION

5.1 The Procedural Framework: Notification, Declaration, and Award

The procedural sequence under the LARR Act—preliminary notification under section 11, objections under section 15, declaration under section 19, notice under section 21, and award under section 23—broadly tracks the 1894 framework but is supplemented by the SIA and the consent requirements at the front end and by R&R obligations at the back end.¹⁸¹⁹ The preliminary notification triggers restrictions on transactions and a structured land survey, with

affected persons entitled to file objections in writing. The Land Acquisition Collector must consider objections and pass a reasoned order before publishing the declaration of acquisition.

5.2 Market Value, Multiplication Factors, and Solatium

Compensation under the LARR Act is calculated under section 26 as the highest of three benchmarks: the minimum land value specified in the Indian Stamp Act, 1899; the average sale price of similar land based on the highest fifty per cent of registered sale deeds in the preceding three years; or the price agreed upon for acquisition of land for a similar purpose.²⁰ To this, section 27 adds a multiplication factor (one for urban land and up to two for rural land), and section 30 awards a solatium of one hundred per cent of the compensation amount.²¹ The First Schedule consolidates the mechanism. The methodology represents a substantial advance over the 1894 framework, where compensation was tethered to often-stale circle rates. Yet judicial decisions caution that mechanical application of the formula does not always produce just compensation. In *Bangalore Development Authority v. R. Hanumaiah*, the Supreme Court emphasised that valuation must reflect actual market conditions and reasonable potentiality.³³

5.3 The Urgency Provisions and Their Misuse

Section 40 of the LARR Act preserves the urgency provisions familiar from the 1894 Act, permitting the State to dispense with SIA, hearings, and certain notices in specified emergency cases.²² The urgency provisions are necessary—genuine emergencies, defence acquisitions, and disaster response cannot await deliberative procedures—but they have been historically prone to abuse. In *Dev Sharan v. State of Uttar Pradesh*²³ and *Radhey Shyam v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, the Supreme Court invalidated invocations of the urgency clause for routine industrial acquisitions, holding that urgency cannot be invoked to bypass procedural safeguards in the absence of demonstrable emergency.²⁴ The doctrinal lesson is clear: urgency must be exceptional, judicially reviewable, and supported by reasoned justification.

5.4 Lapse of Acquisition Proceedings: Section 24

One of the LARR Act's most consequential and litigated provisions is section 24, which provides for the lapse of acquisitions initiated under the 1894 Act where, on the commencement of the LARR Act, compensation has not been paid or possession has not been taken for five years or more.²⁵ The provision sought to remedy the long-standing problem of stalled acquisitions where the State had neither paid nor possessed but kept landowners in perpetual uncertainty. The interpretation of section 24, however, generated extensive litigation.

The Supreme Court in *Pune Municipal Corporation v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki* initially held that mere deposit in the treasury did not amount to 'payment' for the purposes of the section.²⁶ That position was substantially modified by a Constitution Bench in *Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal* (2020), which clarified that the conjunctive 'and' in section 24(2) requires both non-payment and non-possession to invoke the lapse, and that deposit in the treasury can satisfy the payment requirement.²⁷ The doctrinal evolution illustrates the difficulty of operationalising procedural fairness in the face of decades-old, partially-completed acquisitions.

6. REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT

6.1 The R&R Framework under the LARR Act

The most significant innovation of the LARR Act is its integration of rehabilitation and resettlement as a statutory entitlement rather than a discretionary executive grace. Chapters V and VI, read with the Second Schedule, establish a comprehensive R&R framework with detailed entitlements covering housing, basic facilities, employment, livelihood support, and income assistance.²⁸ The framework recognises that displacement entails not merely the loss of land but the disruption of an entire economic, social, and cultural existence. It seeks to ensure that displaced persons are not left worse off than before the acquisition.

6.2 Definition of Affected Families: A Substantive Innovation

Section 3(c) of the LARR Act defines 'affected family' broadly to include not only the landowners but also tenants, agricultural labourers, share-croppers, artisans, and forest-dependent communities whose livelihoods are affected by the acquisition.²⁹ The definition represents a substantive constitutional advance: it acknowledges that the impact of acquisition extends beyond the formal title-holder to encompass everyone whose economic existence is bound up with the land. This recognition was forcefully articulated in *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India*, where the Court engaged with the human costs of displacement and the inadequacy of compensation-only frameworks.³⁰

6.3 Implementation Challenges

Despite the textual ambition of the R&R framework, implementation remains the LARR Act's principal weakness. Empirical studies and judicial commentary consistently document several recurring problems. R&R Committees, while statutorily mandated, are often constituted late or function as rubber-stamp bodies rather than meaningful supervisory institutions. Housing

entitlements are frequently delivered in resettlement colonies remote from livelihood opportunities. Employment guarantees are imperfectly enforced, with displaced persons receiving lump-sum payments in lieu of long-term livelihood support that fail to substitute for the income streams lost. Forest-dependent communities and tribal groups, who frequently lack formal land title, find it difficult to establish 'affected family' status despite the broad statutory definition. Usha Ramanathan's pioneering scholarship has documented the chronic undervaluation of livelihood loss in Indian acquisition jurisprudence and the systemic invisibility of the displaced poor in the legal apparatus.³¹

7. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The trajectory of Indian land acquisition law over the past two centuries describes an arc from imperial extraction to constitutional accountability. The 1894 Act represented the colonial State's instrumental use of land for administrative ends, with minimal procedural safeguards and no obligation of rehabilitation. The LARR Act of 2013, enacted against the backdrop of decades of mass displacement and sustained civil society protest, represents a legislative attempt to embed transparency, deliberation, fair compensation, and structured rehabilitation into the acquisition process. The constitutional framework, anchored in Article 300A and elaborated through judicial interpretation in *K.T. Plantation, Kameshwar Singh*, and most recently *Kolkata Municipal Corporation v. Bimal Kumar Shah*, supplies the doctrinal scaffolding within which the statute operates.

Yet a substantial gap persists between legislative ambition and ground-level reality. The implementation deficit—formalistic SIAs, manipulated consents, misuse of urgency provisions, delayed compensation, and inadequate rehabilitation—threatens to render the LARR Act's substantive promises hollow. Several reforms are accordingly suggested. *First*, the SIA regime should be strengthened through independent expert oversight, mandatory publication of underlying data, and a presumption of judicial reviewability of Expert Group recommendations. *Second*, consent thresholds for private and public-private partnership projects should be enforced with documentary rigour, with independent verification of stated consent and a statutory right of audit. *Third*, urgency provisions under section 40 should be confined to genuine emergencies through legislative amendment requiring contemporaneous reasoned justification and post-hoc judicial review.

Fourth, the compensation methodology under sections 26 and 27 should be supplemented by independent valuation panels and prompt deposit of compensation as a precondition for acquisition becoming effective. *Fifth*, the R&R framework should be re-engineered around

livelihood restoration rather than monetary substitution, with binding employment and income-support obligations on the requiring body and a statutory right of recourse before the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Authority. *Sixth*, the broad statutory definition of 'affected family' under section 3(c) should be operationalised through evidentiary protocols sensitive to forest-dependent and unrecorded users of land. *Seventh*, and most fundamentally, the constitutional content of Article 300A must be progressively elaborated to incorporate not only the right to fair compensation but also the right to rehabilitation as a substantive guarantee. The fundamental insight that emerges from this study is that no acquisition framework, however textually progressive, can by itself secure the substantive constitutional protection that Article 300A promises. Land acquisition law must be embedded in a wider architecture of independent supervision, judicial accountability, structural protections for the most vulnerable, and recognition of the distinctive social and economic significance of land in the Indian context. The challenge for the Indian legal system, as the LARR Act enters its second decade of operation, is to construct that wider architecture in a manner that translates legislative ambition into lived constitutional reality. Strengthening institutional mechanisms, ensuring accountability, and prioritising the rights and welfare of affected persons remain essential to achieving a fair and equitable land acquisition system in India.

ENDNOTES / REFERENCES

1. Land Acquisition Act, No. 1 of 1894, INDIA CODE.
2. Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, No. 30 of 2013, INDIA CODE [hereinafter LARR Act].
3. INDIA CONST. art. 300A.
4. Bengal Regulation I of 1824 (India).
5. Land Acquisition Act, 1894, § 4 (Preliminary Notification), § 6 (Declaration), § 9 (Notice), § 11 (Award).
6. INDIA CONST. art. 19(1)(f) (omitted by the Constitution (Forty-Fourth Amendment) Act, 1978); art. 31 (omitted by the same Amendment).
7. State of Bihar v. Kameshwar Singh, AIR 1952 SC 252 (India).
8. Constitution (Forty-Fourth Amendment) Act, 1978 (India).
9. K.T. Plantation Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Karnataka, (2011) 9 S.C.C. 1 (India).
10. Jilubhai Nanbhai Khachar v. State of Gujarat, (1995) Supp (1) S.C.C. 596 (India).
11. R.C. Cooper v. Union of India, (1970) 1 S.C.C. 248 (India).
12. Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala, (1973) 4 S.C.C. 225 (India).

13. Kolkata Municipal Corporation v. Bimal Kumar Shah, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 968 (India).
14. Bernard Francis Joseph Vaz v. State of Goa, (2011) 5 S.C.C. 351 (India).
15. LARR Act § 2(1) (defining public purpose).
16. LARR Act §§ 4–9 (Social Impact Assessment).
17. LARR Act § 2(2) (consent requirements: 80% for private projects; 70% for public-private partnership projects).
18. LARR Act § 11 (Preliminary Notification).
19. LARR Act § 19 (Declaration); § 21 (Notice); § 23 (Award).
20. LARR Act § 26 (Market Value); § 27 (Multiplication factor); First Schedule.
21. LARR Act § 30 (Solatium of 100% of compensation amount).
22. LARR Act § 40 (Urgency Provisions).
23. Dev Sharan v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2011) 4 S.C.C. 769 (India).
24. Radhey Shyam v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2011) 5 S.C.C. 553 (India).
25. LARR Act § 24 (Lapse of acquisition where compensation not paid or possession not taken).
26. Pune Municipal Corporation v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki, (2014) 3 S.C.C. 183 (India).
27. Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal, (2020) 8 S.C.C. 129 (India).
28. LARR Act, Second Schedule (R&R Entitlements).
29. LARR Act § 3(c) (definition of "affected family").
30. Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India, (2000) 10 S.C.C. 664 (India).
31. Usha Ramanathan, *Displacement and the Law*, 39 Econ. & Pol. Wkly. 3891 (2004).
32. Delhi Airtech Services Pvt. Ltd. v. State of U.P., (2011) 9 S.C.C. 354 (India).
33. Bangalore Development Authority v. R. Hanumaiah, (2005) 12 S.C.C. 508 (India).
34. Anirudh Burman, *The Right to Property and Its Constitutional Evolution in India*, 7 Indian J. Const. L. 55, 60–65 (2013).
35. Sagnik Dutta, *Land Acquisition and Compensation in India: A Critical Analysis*, 12 Indian J.L. & Soc'y 67 (2020); Aarti Gupta, *Social Impact Assessment and Land Acquisition: A Legal Perspective*, 8 Indian L. Rev. 112 (2019).