



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

101

RFA-382-1994 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.07.2026

Mangat Ram

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Ms. Tudhjot K. Sidhu, Advocate
for Mr. J.S. Thind, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Abhishek Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Nischal Chetanya Manchanda, Advocate and
Mr. Akash Choudhary, Advocate for the respondent-MC.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The appellant through instant appeal is seeking modification of award dated 04.11.1993 whereby learned Additional District Judge, Sirsa has not awarded compensation as claimed by him.

2. The State Government issued notification dated 20.09.1983 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short '**1894 Act**') for acquisition of land situated at District Sirsa. The said notification was followed by notification issued under Section 6 of 1894 Act.

3. The Collector vide award dated 26.11.1990, in terms of provisions of 1894 Act, awarded ₹30,591/- towards tubewell and kothas. Feeling dis-satisfied from aforesaid award, the appellant preferred petition before the Collector which were referred to Court under Section 18 of the 1894 Act.

4. The landowner as well as State, in support of their contentions, led their evidence. The State attempted to justify compensation determined



RFA-382-1994 (O&M)

-2-

by Collector, however, landowner vehemently pleaded that compensation has been assessed on lower side.

5. The Reference Court, appreciating evidence led by both sides, by impugned award adjudicated reference petition. The Reference Court vide impugned award enhanced compensation to ₹40,000/- with respect to tubewell and kothas apart from other statutory benefits. Feeling dissatisfied, the appellant/landowner is in appeal.

6. Learned counsel for appellant submits that appellant was granted compensation of ₹40,000/- for tubewell and kothas. From the perusal of assessment framed by the expert, it is evident that value of tubewell is more than ₹1,50,000/-.

7. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

8. Considering the amount involved, period of pendency and argument of appellant, this Court, to resolve the matter, deems it appropriate to direct respondents to pay a sum of ₹60,000/- towards full and final settlement. The appellant shall furnish his bank account details to jurisdictional Sub-Divisional Magistrate who shall ensure release of the aforesaid amount within two months from the date of furnishing of such details.

9. **Allowed** in above terms.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

23.07.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No