

Expropriation With Consent Standards: Public Interest, Valuation and Appeal

Working paper v1.0 · October 2026

© 2026 Free China Movement

Canonical: <https://freechina.live/governance-public-policy/housing-land-property-rights/h2-expropriation-with-consent-standards/>

1. The question

Expropriation is the sharpest test of property rights under any transition government. A democratic state that claims the power to take private or collectively held land must answer four interlocking questions with precision: when is the taking justified at all; how close to real consent must the process get before force is used; how is the value of what is taken measured and paid; and how can an owner stop or correct the taking before possession is lost. Vague public-interest language, opaque valuation, and appeals that lack suspensive effect convert a constitutional power into a fiscal and political instrument. The design problem for a Third Republic is therefore to write rules that keep the power narrow, the process consent-seeking, the compensation full and prior, and the appeal real.

2. The hub's current position

The hub page “[Housing, Land & Property Rights](#)” frames the research domain as governance work on housing, land tenure, property rights, expropriation, compensation, and local fiscal incentives. It covers current Mainland policy, evidence and observed outcomes, and Third Republic alternatives. The page itself is a short landing statement that points to a published dossier on housing governance, urban renewal and local-finance distortions. It does not enumerate specific public-interest tests, valuation formulas, or appeal clocks. Those details are left to companion papers such as this one.

3. Evidence and comparative options

A narrow, enumerated public-interest test outperforms an open-ended one. The ROC (Taiwan) [Land Expropriation Act](#) lists specific undertakings (national defense, communication and transportation, public utilities, water conservancy, public health and environmental protection, government buildings, education and

culture, social welfare, state-owned enterprises, and other undertakings authorized by law) and requires the applicant to evaluate public interest and necessity against social, economic, cultural-ecological and sustainable-development factors before seeking approval. The 2012 revision further tightened procedural gates.

The PRC (Mainland) [2019 revision of the Land Administration Law](#) moved in the same direction by listing six categories: military or diplomatic needs; government-organized infrastructure; public institutions and services; poverty-alleviation relocation and affordable housing; tract development inside urban-construction boundaries approved at provincial level or above; and other circumstances specified by law. The residual category and the tract-development clause remain expansive in practice.

Valuation methods diverge sharply. ROC law after 2012 requires compensation based on current market value determined by a Land Evaluation Committee, with replacement cost for constructional improvements and crop-value or cultivation-cost rules for agricultural improvements. Pre-2012 practice had relied on announced land values plus a premium and produced systematic under-compensation relative to market.

PRC compensation historically used multipliers of average annual agricultural output, later replaced by area-based comprehensive land prices that still often lag urban land values. Resettlement has shifted over decades from job placement to cash to housing, yet documented cases of forced demolition without prior agreement and subsequent court-ordered higher awards remain common.

Appeal routes matter for timing. ROC procedure allows written objection during the announcement period, administrative review, Land Value Evaluation Committee reconsideration, and administrative litigation; however, once compensation is paid the project may proceed even while litigation continues. Suspensive effect is therefore limited. PRC procedure requires pre-expropriation investigation, announcement and hearing, yet enforcement of those steps is uneven and many owners face demolition before effective judicial relief.

Failure modes under PRC practice include repeated patterns of forced demolition when compensation negotiations stall, compensation set far below subsequent market or replacement cost, and local-government fiscal dependence on land-conveyance revenue that incentivizes expansive takings. ROC reforms after earlier controversies (especially the shift to market-value compensation and the public-interest/necessity evaluation) reduced but did not eliminate disputes over valuation methodology and zone-expropriation outcomes.

4. Recommended design

1. Enumerated public-interest grounds. Expropriation is permitted only for: national defense and diplomatic facilities; essential transport, energy, water and communications infrastructure; public schools, hospitals, disaster-prevention and environmental-protection works; social-welfare and affordable-housing projects that meet statutory criteria; and other purposes expressly authorized by primary legislation. Every application must demonstrate necessity and that no less-intrusive alternative (including negotiated purchase, temporary use rights or redesign) is reasonably available.

2. Mandatory prior negotiation and consent-seeking. The acquiring authority must conduct documented good-faith negotiation for at least 90 days, publish the proposed taking and compensation offer, hold a public hearing, and record all owner responses. Only after these steps may a formal expropriation order be sought.

3. Independent valuation. Compensation is based on fair market value of the land and improvements as of the announcement date, plus full resettlement cost where a primary residence is taken. The owner may appoint an independent appraiser at public expense; disagreement triggers a three-member valuation panel (one appointed by each side, the third by mutual agreement or by a court). The panel's reasoned determination is binding unless set aside on judicial review for clear error.

4. Full compensation paid or secured before possession. Payment or court deposit of the full award (including resettlement support) must precede transfer of possession. Narrow emergency exceptions (imminent public-safety threat) require immediate judicial authorization and subsequent full compensation with interest.

5. Notice, hearing and written reasons. Every affected owner and lawful occupant receives individualized notice, access to the application file, the right to be heard, and a written decision stating the public-interest ground, the necessity finding, and the valuation basis.

6. Appeal with suspensive effect and short clocks. An owner may appeal the expropriation order or the compensation amount to a specialized land court or ordinary court within 30 days. Filing of a timely appeal on the public-interest or necessity ground suspends possession until final judgment or an interim court order lifting the stay. Courts decide compensation appeals within 90 days and public-interest appeals within 120 days unless extended for good cause shown.

7. Special protections for collectively owned rural land and informal occupants. Collective owners must approve any taking by the decision rule already governing that collective's internal affairs; individual members retain personal claims for their share of compensation and resettlement. Lawful long-term occupants without formal title receive compensation for improvements and relocation assistance on the same terms as titled owners.

8. Public register. Every taking, the public-interest ground relied upon, the valuation method, the compensation paid, and the final outcome of any appeal are entered in a publicly searchable register within 30 days of finality.

5. Open questions and risks

Fiscal exposure for local government is real: full market-value and resettlement awards will raise the cost of infrastructure and urban projects. Transparent budgeting and national-level co-financing for genuinely national public works can mitigate the pressure without reopening the valuation rules. Holdout dynamics exist, yet the combination of mandatory negotiation, independent valuation and short judicial clocks reduces the strategic value of pure obstruction. The greatest long-term risk is judicial or administrative expansion of “public interest” by precedent; the enumerated list, the necessity and least-intrusive-alternative tests, and the public register are designed to make such expansion visible and contestable. Residual ambiguity remains around the precise boundary of “affordable housing” and “tract development” analogues; those categories should be further specified by primary legislation rather than left to administrative discretion.

6. Cross-links

This paper is a research companion to the hub page “[Housing, Land & Property Rights](#)” . It is designed to be read with the sibling paper H1 “Land Rights After Collective Ownership” (same series) and with LG-09 “Fiscal Power Follows

Responsibility” and LG-12 “Who Decides Who Governs What?” (the local-government blueprint series).

7. Sources

- ROC (Taiwan), [Land Expropriation Act](#) (Ministry of Justice laws database, English text) — enumerated undertakings, public-interest and necessity evaluation, and the post-2012 market-value compensation rules discussed in Section 3.
- PRC (Mainland), [Land Administration Law \(2019 Amendment\)](#), [full text](#) — the six public-interest categories of Article 45 and the district comprehensive land-price compensation provisions discussed in Section 3.
- The hub page: [Housing, Land & Property Rights](#) — position summarized in Section 2.