



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

**CWP-27541-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.07.2026**

Anita Devi and Another ...Petitioners
Versus
State of Haryana and Others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Jagmohan S. Ghumman, Advocate and
Mr. Naveen Singh Thakur, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Abhinav Kalia, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vikas P. Singh, Advocate for respondent No.3.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking seeking direction to respondents to decide their representation dated 18.07.2018 for redetermination of compensation on the basis of award dated 08.05.2007. They are further seeking direction to respondents to make the payment in lieu of the award.

2. The State Government issued notification dated 16.01.2007 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short '1894 Act') for acquisition of 2140 Kanal 4 Marlas land situated within the revenue estate of village Jharli, Tehsil Matanhail, District Jhajjar with intent to construct Aiavali Power Company Private Limited. The said notification was followed by notification dated 12.04.2007 issued under Section 6 of 1894 Act.

3. The Collector vide Award dated 08.05.2007, in terms of provisions of 1894 Act, determined compensation payable to landowners. Market value of the acquired land was determined as ₹ 16 Lakh per acre.

Landowners were held entitled to solatium and other statutory benefits. Feeling dis-satisfied from aforesaid award, landowners preferred petitions before the Collector which were referred to Court under Section 18 of the 1894 Act.

4. The landowners as well as State, in support of their contentions, led their evidence. The State attempted to justify market value determined by Collector, however, landowners vehemently pleaded that value of their land has been assessed on lower side.

5. The Reference Court, appreciating evidence led by both sides, by impugned common award adjudicated petitions. The Reference Court has dismissed the petitioners on the ground that the compensation granted was appropriate.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent, at the outset, submits that petitioner’s representation stand addressed, thus, petition has rendered infructuous.

7. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he may be granted liberty to challenge order dated 31.08.2022 which has been passed during the pendency of present petition.

8. ***Disposed of*** with aforesaid liberty.

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

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

14.07.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No