



2026:AHC:84823-DB

[AFR]

**Reserved On : 2<sup>nd</sup> April, 2026**

**Pronounced On : 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2026**

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**WRIT - C No. - 12447 of 2026**

Bhullan Singh And 3 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Manoj Kumar Singh, Rajesh Kumar Singh

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C., Pankaj Kumar Shukla

---

**Court No. - 29**

**HON'BLE ARINDAM SINHA, J.  
HON'BLE PRASHANT KUMAR, J.**

(Per Prashant Kumar, J.)

**Factual Matrix**

1. The instant writ petition has been preferred by four petitioners who all are owners of a land situated in District Shamli where they have the crops and trees planted on the land. Over this land, the respondent Nos.2 and 3 are setting up a High Tension Electricity Transmission Line and because of which the petitioners suffer from the loss of crops, trees and devaluation of the land. As far as trees are concerned, certain compensation has been awarded but no compensation has been awarded for the corridor area over which the high tension wire passes through (known as Right of Way, 'RoW'). The Government of India through Ministry of Power had issued certain guidelines by means of a Government Order ( in short, 'G.O.') dated 15.10.2015 which provides for payment of compensation towards damages with regard to RoW for transmission lines as well as for the tower base area.

2. As per G.O. dated 15.10.2015, 85% of the land value has to be paid by the District Magistrate on the tower base area on which the heavy metallic tower is set up. Further, a compensation towards diminution of land value

(in the width of RoW corridor due to laying of transmission line) was to be awarded which was subject to the maximum 15% of the land value as determined on circle rate/ guideline value/ Stamp Act rate.

3. The Government of India through Ministry of Power issued another guideline vide G.O. dated 14.06.2024 for payment with regard to RoW for transmission lines wherein the compensation for the tower base area was increased to 200 % and the land value for RoW corridor area was increased to 30% of the land value.

4. Again the Government of India through Ministry of Power issued another circular on 21.03.2025 providing a supplementary guideline for payment of compensation with regard to RoW for transmission line of inter-state high voltage electricity lines.

5. The respondent authorities while determining the compensation of trees and crops coming under the transmission line area failed to follow the guidelines and provided no compensation for the RoW of corridor area. The petitioners made several representations to the respondents but no heed was paid to it.

6. Aggrieved by this situation, the petitioners preferred a writ petition being Writ-C No.20077 of 2025 (Pradeep Kumar and others vs. State of U.P. and others) which was disposed of by a Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 04.11.2025 with the following directions:-

*"5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and without going into the merits of the case, we dispose off the writ petition permitting each petitioners to file separate representation under Rule 3 (2) of the Works of Licensees Rules, 2006 ventilating their grievances before the respondent nos. 5-District Magistrate, Shamli & respondent no.6-District Magistrate, Saharanpur along with a certified copy of this order within a period of one month from today. In case any such representation is filed by the petitioners, concerned respondent authority shall pass separate orders on the representation of each petitioners strictly in accordance with law after giving due notice and opportunity of hearing to each petitioners within a period of two months thereafter."*

7. As per the directions given by this Court, the petitioners preferred representation on 21.11.2025 and 21.01.2026 to the respondents raising the grievance and requested the respondents for compensation of land, trees and the damage crops. The respondents by the help of police force opened the high tension electricity line on 05.02.2026.

8. On 10.03.2026, the respondent No.4 disposed of the representation filed by the petitioners wherein he stated that the State had implemented the earlier G.O. dated 15.10.2015 but however, since the G.O. dated 14.06.2024 issued by the Ministry of Power has not been implemented by the State and no compensation has been awarded to them. It has been further stated that since the transmission line was not inter-state transmission line hence, the G.O. dated 21.03.2025 will not be applicable.

9. The order dated 10.03.2026 by which the representation of the petitioners was rejected has been assailed by means of the instant writ petition. The petitioners had made the following prayer:-

*"(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order-dated 10.03.2026 (Annexure No.1) passed by respondent no.4.*

*(ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to provide the compensation to the petitioners of their land coming in ROW Corridor Area, adequate compensation for trees and crops of the petitioners being damaged in the construction of Transmission Line of 220 KV and trees still standing within the Corridor Area as per the prescribed rate of forest department and as per guidelines issued by Union of India, Ministry of Power, New Delhi vide its circular/government orders-dated 15th October, 2015, 14.06.2024 and 21.03.2025*

*(iii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing to the respondent authorities not to supply the electricity through aforesaid transmission line without*

*cutting/removing the trees standing below the transmission line."*

10. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the transmission company has erected towers and the high voltage transmission line over the land of the petitioners and a meager compensation had been given for the crops, trees and tower base area although the compensation should have been awarded as per the latest G.O. However, nothing has been awarded towards the compensation for the RoW of the high tension wire. He further submits that the value of the land has drastically diminished because of the overhead wires and restriction of carrying on any other activities under the wire.

11. He further submits that the issue of compensation has been considered by the Government of India vide G.O. dated 15.10.2015 wherein some compensation had been awarded for the tower base area and over the RoW. The Government of India re-visited the issue of compensation and again issued a G.O. on 14.06.2024 wherein the compensation of the tower base area had been increased to 200 % of the land value and for right of way the compensation was increased to 30% of the land value. This G.O. has not been implemented by the State of U.P. in spite of clear direction of the Government of India vide G.O. dated 14.06.2024 and a G.O. dated 21.03.2025 which lays down the guidelines for compensation.

12. He further submits that the petitioners had earlier moved a writ petition wherein this Court vide order dated 04.11.2025 had directed that the representation of the petitioners shall be decided within one month. From the orders of this Court, a representation was filed on 21.11.2025 however, no decision was taken on it within the stipulated time. On the contrary, during the pendency of this representation before the authorities, the authorities forcibly lay down the overhead cables without complying the orders of this Court and thereafter, rejected the representation of the petitioners by means of the impugned order. He further submits that action taken by the respondents are completely illegal and contrary to the norms laid down by the Government of India and as such the same may be set aside and a just and proper compensation should have been awarded to the petitioners.

13. He further submits that because of laying high tension cables, the value of the land of the petitioners below the wire and adjacent to the RoW have been permanently diminished and nothing can come up under that. The land of the petitioners cannot be put to any other beneficial use.

14. He further submits that the guideline issued by the Government of India had been followed in many States in toto, hence there was no reason for the State of U.P. to deny the compensation to the petitioners which had already been sanctioned by the Government of India.

15. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that there are provisions of compensation under the applicable Electricity Act and the Telegraph Act which are applicable in this field. Notifications had been issued by the Government of India through Ministry of Power wherein the Government relies that a just and proper compensation should be paid to the farmers however, the same has been refused by the respondents to the present petitioners.

16. Mr. Raj Mohan Upadhyay, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel appears on behalf of State. He draws attention to supplementary guidelines dated 21.03.2025 issued by Government of India and demonstrates from it, applicability of the guidelines have been confined to inter state transmission systems and further submits that the transmission line in this case is not an inter-state transmission line, hence the G.O. dated 21.03.2025 would not be applicable. Relied upon applicability clause in the supplementary guidelines is reproduced below.

*"1. Applicability: These supplementary guidelines shall apply to Inter-State Transmission System lines only in cases where landowners have objected to the compensation because the Circle Rates are below the Market Rates. State Governments may adopt these guidelines in their entirety or issue their own modified guidelines. These guidelines shall apply in cases where State Governments have yet to specify the manner of determination of market value of land."*

*(emphasis supplied)*

Moreover, State Governments have discretion regarding their applicability.

17. Mr. Pankaj Kumar Shukla, learned advocate appears on behalf of respondent nos.2 and 3 submits that the writ petition is not maintainable as the petitioners have remedy of revision. Without prejudice he submits, the guidelines are not in any way enforceable through the writ Court. He opposes the writ petition and seeks dismissal of the writ petition.

18. Heard Mr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Raj Mohan Upadhyay, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel appears on behalf of State, Mr. Pankaj Kumar Shukla, learned advocate appears on behalf of respondent nos.2 and 3 (the transmission company) and perused the records.

19. In this field, in the the year 1910 the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 was first enacted thereafter, the Electricity Supply Act in 1948 and then Electricity Regulation Commission Act, 1998 was enacted.

20. Initially, the entire field of electricity was in the hands of Government however, later on this field of electricity was bifurcated in generation, transmission, distribution, trading and use of electricity in India. The private operators were also inducted to achieve the objects of the Act and thereafter, the Electricity Act, 2003 was enacted repealing the earlier Acts.

21. One of the key objectives of 2003 Act was promoting competition within its framework and allowed private sector participation in power generation, supply and distribution of electricity in India. The relevant Section of Electricity Act is as follows:-

*"Section 38 of the Electricity Act lays down as follows:-*

***"Central Transmission Utility and functions.- (1)***

*The Central Government may notify any Government company as the Central Transmission Utility:*

*Provided that the Central Transmission Utility shall not engage in the business of generation of electricity or trading in electricity:*

*Provided further that the Central Government may transfer, and vest any property, interest in property, rights and liabilities connected with, and personnel involved in transmission of electricity of such Central Transmission Utility, to a company or companies to be incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956 to function as a transmission licensee, through a transfer scheme to be effected in the manner specified under Part XIII and such company or companies shall be deemed to be transmission licensees under this Act.*

*(2) The functions of the Central Transmission Utility shall be -*

*(a) to undertake transmission of electricity through inter-State transmission system;*

*(b) to discharge all functions of planning and co-ordination relating to inter-State transmission system with -*

*(i) State Transmission Utilities;*

*(ii) Central Government;*

*(iii) State Governments;*

*(iv) generating companies;*

*(v) Regional Power Committees;*

*(vi) Authority;*

*(vii) licensees;*

*(viii) any other person notified by the Central Government in this behalf;*

*(c) to ensure development of an efficient, co-*

*ordinated and economical system of inter-State transmission lines for smooth flow of electricity from generating stations to the load centres;*

*(d) to provide non-discriminatory open access to its transmission system for use by-*

*(i) any licensee or generating company on payment of the transmission charges; or*

*(ii) any consumer as and when such open access is provided by the State Commission under sub-section (2) of section 42, on payment of the transmission charges and a surcharge thereon, as may be specified by the Central Commission:*

*Provided that such surcharge shall be utilised for the purpose of meeting the requirement of current level cross-subsidy:*

*Provided further that such surcharge and cross subsidies shall be progressively reduced 1[\*\*\*] in the manner as may be specified by the Central Commission:*

*[\*\*\*]*

*Provided also that the manner of payment and utilisation of the surcharge shall be specified by the Central Commission:*

*Provided also that such surcharge shall not be leviable in case open access is provided to a person who has established a captive generating plant for carrying the electricity to the destination of his own use.""*

22. Part VIII of the Electricity Act, 2003 deals with 'Works' which only encompasses two Sections i.e. Sections 67 and 68. Section 67 deals with the determination and payment of compensation of rent to the person affected by the work carried out under this Section. Section 68 deals with overhead lines. Section 76 of the Electricity Act, 2003 grants power to the Central Government to make rules.

23. Further, Section 164 of the Electricity Act, 2003 provides that the appropriate Government may confer upon any public officer, licensee or any other person engaged in supplying of electricity, any of the powers which the telegraph authority possesses under the Act of 1885 with respect to placing of telegraph lines and poles as provided under the Telegraphic Act.

24. Section 176 (2)(ii)(e) of the Electricity Act, 2003 lays down as follows:-

*"the works of licensees affecting the property of owner or occupier under sub-section (2) of Section 67;"*

The effect of this Section is that the provisions of both the Acts will be applicable while determining the compensation of the land on which the overhead wire passes through (right of way) and the poles and towers were installed. The instant case is regarding the compensation to be awarded for the losses suffered by the land owners on which the transmission lines passes.

25. The transmission lines basically have two components, firstly, the towers installed on the ground and secondly, the overhead wires which passes over the land of private individuals which is also known as land corridor over which the wire hangs. Once a tower is erected on the field/land of an individual and the wire gone through his property, the potential of land diminish. There are certain restrictions which are imposed on the owner of the land like no structures can be build under and around the right of way, no trees can be planted and nothing can come up on that land in future.

26. Under the power granted under the Electricity Act and the Rules, the Government of India through Ministry of power had issued a G.O. on 15.10.2015 which provides compensation to the land owners over which the high tension wires passes through and which causes the land to loose its value, this order states as follows:-

*(i) Compensation @ 85% of land value as determined by District Magistrate, or any other authority based on Circle*

*rate/Guideline value/Stamp Act rates for tower base area (between four legs) impacted severely due to installation of tower/pylon structure;*

*(ii) Compensation towards diminution of land value in the width of Row corridor due to laying of transmission line and imposing certain restriction would be decided by states as per categorization of land in different places of states, subject to a maximum of 15% of land value as determined based on Circle rate/Guideline value/Stamp Act rates;*

*(iii) In areas where landowner/owners have been offered/accepted alternate mode of by concerned compensation corporation/Municipality under Transfer Development Right (TDR) policy of State, the licensee/utility shall deposit compensation amount as per (i) & (11) above with the concerned corporation/Municipality/Local Body or the State Government,*

*(iv) For this purpose, the width of RoW Corridor shall not be more than that prescribed in para. 1.3 (of the Report of the Committee for Payment of Compensation in Regard to the Right of Way for Transmission Lines) and shall not be less than the width directly below the conductors."*

27. Since there was certain hiccups, the Government of India, through Ministry of Power again issued a comprehensive guideline for award of compensation to the land owners who suffer from loss of land value because of setting of the transmission line over the land. The Notification dated 14.06.2024 issued by The Ministry of Power is as follows:-

***"COMPENSATION GUIDELINES FOR TRANSMISSION LINES***

***(1) Applicability:*** *The compensation shall be payable only for transmission lines supported by a tower base of 66 kv voltage level and above, and not for sub- transmission and dishibution lines below 66 kV.*

***(2) Authority for determination of Compensation:*** *District Magistrate/District collector/Deputy commissioner shall be the authority for determining the compensation.*

**(3) Determination of compensation:** *The compensation shall ordinarily be based on the circle rate/Guideline value/stamp Act rates of the land, except where the market rate exceeds the circle rate/Guideline value/Stamp Act rates. In such instances, the land value shall be determined based on the prevailing market rate as ascertained by the District Magistrate/District Collector/Deputy Commissioner in the manner as may be specified by the state Government. The determined land value shall serve as the basis for compensation and shall be promptly communicated by the respective District Magistrate/District Collector/Deputy Commissioner.*

**(4) Tower Base compensation:** *Compensation for the tower base area shall be 200% of the land value. The tower base area shall be the area enclosed by the four legs of the tower at ground level, plus an additional one (1) meter extension on each side.*

**(5) RoW Corridor compensation:** *The compensation amount for Right-of-way (RoW) corridor shall be 30% of the land value. Land within the RoW corridor, as defined in Schedule VII of the Central Electricity Authority (Technical Standards for construction of Electrical Plants and Electric Lines) Regulations, 2022 (Annex-I), shall be eligible for compensation. This compensation will address the potential diminution of land value due to the presence of overhead lines or underground cables within the RoW corridor. No construction activity of any kind would be permitted within the Row of the transmission line. states/UTs may decide higher rate depending on the area and urgency of the work.*

**(6) Alternate compensation:** *In areas where land owner/owners have been offered/accepted alternate mode of compensation by Corporation/Municipality concerned under Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) policy of the State/UT, the licensee /utility shall deposit compensation amount as per (4) to (5) above with the corporation/ Municipality/ Local Development Authority or the State Government concerned.*

**(7) Areas with Row constraints:** *when laying transmission*

*lines in areas with hoW constraints, various technologies can be considered to optimize the use of space. These technologies are outlined in the Central Electricity Authority (Technical Standards for Construction of Electrical Plants and Electric Lines) Regulations, 2022. Some options include: steel pole structures, narrow-based lattice towers, multi-circuit and multi-voltage towers, single-side stringing with lattice or steel poles, XLPE underground cables, Gas Insulated Lines (GIL), compact towers with insulated cross arms, Voltage Source Converter (VSC) based High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) systems, and more. A cost matrix comparing these technologies is attached in Annex-II for reference by implementing agencies. This matrix can help them choose the most cost-effective option for each project.*

**(8) Landowner Identification:** *During the check survey conducted at the execution stage, the names of landowners whose property falls within the transmission line's Right-of-Way (RoW) will be documented. This process shall adhere to the Regulation 84(8) of the Central Electricity Authority (Technical Standards for Construction of Electrical Plants and Electric Lines) Regulations, 2022.*

**(9) Compensation Payment:** *Compensation payment shall be one-time and upfront. Whenever possible, compensation will be paid through various digital payment methods, such as the Aadhaar Enabled Payment System (AEPS) and Unified Payments Interface (UPI).*

**(10) Standard Operating Procedure (SOP):** *States/UTs and transmission developers should refer to the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) at Annex-III for detailed guidelines."*

28. Thereafter, the Government of India had issued a supplementary guideline on 21.03.2025 for determination of market value and the right of way, compensation for inter-state transmission lines. The relevant portion of the Notification dated 21.03.2025 is as follows:-

**"SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINATION**

*OF MARKET RATE AND ROW COMPENSATION FOR ISTS LINES*

**1. Applicability:** *These supplementary guidelines shall apply to Inter-State Transmission System lines only in cases where landowners have objected to the compensation because the Circle Rates are below the Market Rates. State Governments may adopt these guidelines in their entirety or issue their own modified guidelines. These guidelines shall apply in cases where State Governments have yet to specify the manner of determination of market value of land.*

**2. Committee for Market Rate Determination:** *The market rate of land shall be determined by the following Market Rate Committee (MRC) based on the valuation by independent land valuers:*

- i. District Magistrate/District Collector/Deputy Commissioner or his/her nominee (not below Sub-Divisional Magistrate) – Chair*
- ii. Representative of land owners – Member*
- iii. Nominee of ISTS Transmission Service Provider (TSP) - Member*

*The District Magistrate/District Collector/Deputy Commissioner may co-opt upto two additional members as may be required.*

**3. Land Valuation Methodology:**

*(1) MRC shall appoint two valuers-one nominated by the TSP and the other by the representative of landowners. The MRC shall engage the land valuers empanelled by the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Board of India (1881) as per the list available at website of IBBI (<https://ibbi.gov.in>). The valuers should preferably be from the same State or, if an adequate pool of valuers is not available, from adjoining States. The reference market rate shall be determined as specified below.*

*(i) If the difference in the market rates worked out by valuers is less than 20% over the lowest value, then average value of the two valuations shall be taken as the reference market rate.*

*(ii) If the difference exceeds 20%, MRC may negotiate the reference market rate.*

*(iii) Else, or if negotiation fails, then MRC shall engage a third valuer, and the reference market value shall be determined as the average of the two closest valuations.*

*(2) The assessed reference market rate shall serve as the basis for determination of market rate by the MRC.*

*(3) The professional fee/charges of the land valuers shall be borne by the TSP and shall form part of the Row compensation cost.*

**4. Compensation Rates:** *(1) The compensation for tower base shall be as per RoW guidelines dated 14.06.2024.*

*(2) The compensation amount for Right-of-Way (RoW) corridor shall be as follows for ISTS lines:*

*i. 30% of the land value in rural areas.*

*ii. 60% of the land value in municipal corporations and metropolitan areas notified by the State Government.*

*iii. 45% of the land value for municipalities, nagar panchayats and all other urban planning areas notified by the State Government.*

*5. The District Collector may allow the construction of ISTS lines to proceed without obstruction on the condition that compensation would be paid based on the market rate determined by the MRC. The market rate determination should ideally be completed within one month from the date of application by TSP.*

**6. Pass through by CERC:** *If the actual Row compensation paid by the TSP due to implementation of these guidelines or the extant guidelines /policy of the appropriate government differs from the base Row compensation determined for the ISTS Scheme as per Tariff Based Competitive Bidding (TBCB) Guidelines, the same shall be eligible for pass through under Change in Law (CIL) by the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission."*

29. It is clear that setting up of the transmission line is a public interest project which can be put at par with other public projects like setting up a dam or building a road. In the other infrastructure projects land is acquired by the Government and handed over to the licensee and a compensation is paid to the owner of the land however, in this case land has not been acquired but at the same time, a number of restrictions have been imposed on the land owners. For example, they cannot have trees on that area and no construction can be carried out in the RoW area and there are several other restrictions which the owners have to face for the land adjoining the RoW with the result the value of the land is drastically diminished. The Government refuses to pay a compensation on the ground that the land has not been acquired however, without even acquiring the land all the valuable rights of the land owners are being taken away from the land owners and that too without providing any compensation.

30. Since the land remains a State subject, number of States have come up with notification/circular where the methodology proposed is at variance with the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Power. The State of Uttar Pradesh has come out with the guideline that only 85% of the land value would be paid for the tower base and nothing would be paid for the land corridor area/RoW.

31. The Ministry of Power had given a guideline to the States and several States have implemented the same wherein they provide certain compensation for the land corridor area/RoW however, since it was a guideline, the State of U.P. chooses to provide nothing towards the compensation for the loss of valuable rights of the land owners.

32. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Kerala State Electricity Board v. Livisha and Others** reported in (2007) 6 SCC 792, had observed as follows:

*"9. Both telegraph lines and electric lines are required to be drawn over the agricultural land and other properties belonging to third parties. In drawing such lines, the entire*

*land cannot be acquired but the effect thereof would be diminution of value of the property over which such lines is drawn.*

\*\*\*\*

*The amount of compensation is required to be determined keeping in view the purpose and object of the statute. There cannot be any fixed formula therefor or the other. Although undoubtedly one formula laid down may assist the Board and/or the Reference Court to apply the same, but there cannot be a hard-and-fast rule in this behalf. A fixed formula for determining the amount of compensation although may make the task of the Land Acquisition Officer or the Reference Court easier but in our opinion each case is required to be taken on its own merit. We may hasten to add that the purpose and object of the Act and the methodology laid down therein for the purpose thereof should be the guiding factor.*

\*\*\*\*

*The situs of the land, the distance between the high voltage electricity line laid thereover, the extent of the line thereon as also the fact as to whether the high voltage line passes over a small tract of land or through the middle of the land and other similar relevant factors in our opinion would be determinative. The value of the land would also be a relevant factor. The owner of the land furthermore, in a given situation may lose his substantive right to use the property for the purpose for which the same was meant to be used."*

33. Since the issue of compensation of the land which lies on the RoW of high tension wire has already been addressed by the Central Government, hence it is imperative on the State Government to follow the same in toto. The procedure of calculating the compensation has been given in the G.O. dated 15.10.2015, G.O. dated 14.06.2024 and in G.O. dated 21.03.2025, which makes mandatory to pay the compensation affront to the owners on whose land the high tension wires passes through and the tower base are erected.

34. The Government Order issued by the Government of India through the Ministry of Power, must have effect on the State. There is no available material to form a reasonable basis for the State of Uttar Pradesh to have exercised discretion in the negative, to distress of affected land holders. The respondents are directed to follow the guidelines issued by the Government of India through the Ministry of Power vide G.O. dated 14.06.2024 (since it is not an inter-state transmission line, hence the G.O. dated 21.03.2025 would not be applicable in this case). Therefore, the respondents herein are bound to pay compensation as per the G.O. dated 14.06.2024. Even the Government of India recognizes that upfront compensation should be paid before the transmission lines are set up. However, in this case in spite of the direction of this Court to decide the representation in four weeks, the representation was kept pending and it is only after using the police force when the wires on the petitioners' land was set up and energized, the representation was dealt with and rejected.

35. The respondents herein, cannot be selective in implementing the G.O. issued by the Government of India. As per the G.O. dated 06.09.2018 numbered as Letter No.2023/24-P-3-2018 issued by the State of U.P., the earlier G.O. dated 15.10.2015 of the Government of India was implemented by the State however, the State very conveniently fails to implement the other G.O. dated 14.06.2024. The State cannot be choosy and selective when it comes to the grant of compensation to the farmers whose land has been forcefully been used and the value of the land has been drastically diminished.

36. In this case, the transmission line is not an inter-state line hence, the respondents are directed to grant compensation as per the guidelines issued by the Government of India vide G.O. dated 14.06.2024 passed by the Ministry of Power.

37. In view of aforesaid facts and circumstances of the matter, the impugned order dated 10.03.2026 is quashed and this writ petition is **allowed**.

38. This compensation shall be paid within a period of four weeks from communication of this judgment to respondent no.2, to be made by

petitioners.

**(Arindam Sinha,J.)**

**(Prashant Kumar,J.)**

**April 17, 2026**

Saurabh Yadav/-