

The Court charges the jury that the landowner in this case is entitled to just compensation; and the term "just compensation" includes not only the value of the land actually taken and appropriated to the use of the State of Alabama, but the injury to the remaining lands, and if the ways of ingress to and egress from the remaining lands will be obstructed or interrupted, such obstruction or interruption forms a part of the injury, for which compensation should be made.

*Spencer*

The Court charges the jury that in a condemnation proceeding such as this where only a part of a tract of land is taken, that the owner is entitled to compensation equal to the difference between the value of the entire tract before the taking and the value of the part remaining after the taking; and in determining the value of the property after the taking the jury should consider any factor or circumstance which would depreciate the value in any way, including any effect that the completed project for which the land is condemned may produce on the remaining tract.

*Refused*

The Court charges the jury that the final inquiry in determining the amount of compensation and damages, if any, to which the landowners in this case are entitled for the difference between the value of the tract before and after the completion of the project; and in answering this final inquiry it is proper for you to consider all circumstances which depreciate the value of the tract as a direct result of the work.

*Given*

L-4

The Court charges the jury that if you believe from the evidence in this case that a four-lane non-access highway is to be built across the land involved in this case, then you may consider, in arriving at the just compensation to which the landowner is entitled, the fact that the landowner cannot cross the highway from one part of the remaining tract to another and must use a circuitous route to go from one to the other, where formerly the tract was not divided.

*G. L. Lavin*

L-5

The Court charges the jury that in assessing the damages, if any, to which the landowner in this case is entitled by virtue of the condemnation of a right-of-way across the land in question for a controlled or limited access highway you may consider the fact or circumstance that the landowner is denied access to the highway, even though no highway had ever been built on this tract of land and the proposed highway is to be built on a new right-of-way.

*Revised*

L-6

The Court charges the jury that in arriving at the amount of damages, if any, to which you believe the landowner in this case is entitled you may consider the inconvenience to the remaining tract resulting from the condemnation.

*L. J. Lavin*