



CWP-18203-2026

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Item No.114

CWP-18203-2026

Date of Decision: 02.09.2026

Jagsir Singh Brar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Raghav Gulati, Advocate for the petitioners
Mr. Puru Jarewal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
Ms. Lashika Singh, Advocate (*through video conferencing*) and
Mr. Mukesh Tomar, Advocate
for respondent Nos.4 and 5-NHAI

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondents to release interest in terms of Section 80 of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short '**2013 Act**') which accrued on the delayed payment of compensation towards compulsory acquisition of land in terms of awards dated 09.07.2021 (Annexure P-1) and 24.03.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by respondent No.2-Competent Authority for Land Acquisition.

2. The respondents issued notification dated 22.12.2020 under Section 3A(1) of National Highways Act, 1956 (for short '**1956 Act**') for the acquisition of land situated within the revenue estate of Village Dyalpura Bhaika and Village Gaunspura, District Bathinda. Respondent No.2 by way of awards dated 09.07.2021 and 24.03.2023 acquired the land. The



CWP-18203-2026

-2-

respondents took physical possession of the acquired land without disbursing the compensation. The landowners approached this Court by way of *CWP No.19297 of 2025* seeking release of compensation amount which was disposed of vide order dated 02.02.2026 with a direction to the respondents to release the compensation amount. They vide representation dated 04.05.2026 addressed to respondents sought interest on the delayed payment but the same has not been decided till date.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that land was acquired vide notification dated 22.12.2020 issued under Section 3A of 1956 Act. The Collector passed awards on 09.07.2021 and 24.03.2023. The respondent paid partial amount in 2023, however, remaining amount i.e. ₹2.54 Crores was paid in 2026. The respondent was liable to pay interest under Section 80 for the delayed payment of compensation because possession was taken in 2023.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that possession of the acquired land was taken in 2024. The undisputed amount was released in 2023, however, remaining amount could not be released because of dispute of consolidation. The Director, Consolidation of Holdings, Punjab determined the dispute vide order dated 15.10.2025. On the basis of aforesaid order, the Revenue Officer made correction in LA-7 Register by way of mutation dated 06.02.2026. The petitioner supplied requisite documents on 09.02.2026 and compensation was released on 23.02.2026. There was no delay on the part respondent-State.

5. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was lapse on the part of Revenue Authority which did not adjudicate



CWP-18203-2026

-3-

their dispute under Section 42 of East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 (for short '**1948 Act**'))

6. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

7. A perusal of the record reveals that respondent paid partial assessed compensation in 2023. Remaining compensation which comes to ₹2.54 Crores was paid in 2026. The respondent in its reply has candidly submitted that there was dispute between the parties. The matter was pending before competent authority under Section 42 of 1948 Act. The petitioners filed *CWP No.19297 of 2025* before this Court wherein cognizance of pendency of consolidation proceedings was taken. The Director, Land Records, Punjab was asked to file status report of proceedings under Section 42. The Director, Consolidation vide order dated 15.10.2025 allowed correction of consolidation record *qua* land in question. Order dated 15.10.2025 passed by Director, Consolidation of Holdings resolved the matter. The jurisdictional Revenue Officer incorporated necessary correction in LA-7 Register vide entry dated 06.02.2026. The petitioner submitted complete documents on 09.02.2026 and respondent released compensation on 23.02.2026.

The afore-stated sequence of events reveals that there was no lapse on the part of respondents. The compensation could not be released on account of dispute of consolidation. Had the respondent released compensation, there could arise multiple issues and may lead to litigation. It could adversely affect rights of the petitioners. The respondent could be asked to pay interest had there been lapse on its part. By paying partial compensation where there was no dispute, the respondent expressed its *bona*

fide intention. There was no occasion to delay when almost 50% compensation was paid within time.

8. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

02.09.2026
Mohit Kumar

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