

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

CWP No. 15001 of 1994
Date of Decision:14.7.2015

Improvement Trust, Patiala

---Petitioner

versus

Land Acquisition Tribunal, Patiala and others

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Kumar Mittal
Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr. M.L.Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner

None for the respondents.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Rekha Mittal, J.

The instant writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India lays challenge to award dated 9.4.1994 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Land Acquisition Tribunal, Patiala (in short 'the Tribunal') in respect of acquisition of land of Harchand Singh, respondent No. 3 for the purpose of scheme known as Shaheed Sewa Singh Theekriwal Nagar, Patiala.

2. Counsel for the petitioner would contend that the Tribunal awarded compensation at the rate of ₹ 15/- per square yard for land falling

in Block -A, ₹ 12/- per square yard for land in Block-B which is towards Block-A upto the depth of half of Block-B and ₹ 10/- per square yard for remaining land in Block-B. The claimants were also held entitled to benefits of solatium and interest as per the amended provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. It is argued that compensation assessed by the Tribunal is exorbitant and liable to be reduced.

3. We have heard counsel for the petitioner and perused the records.

4. Counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to dispute that bunch of writ petitions filed by the trust and land owners in respect of award dated 9.4.1994 has been decided by this Court and the petitions filed by the Trust for setting aside award of the Tribunal or reducing the amount of compensation have since been dismissed. In the light of decision of this Court in CWP No. 12032 of 1995 referred to in the judgment passed in CWP No. 8635 of 1994 and decision dated 24.8.2005 in the bunch of writ petitions, in our considered opinion, nothing survives for consideration of this Court.

5. In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition sans merit and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

(Ajay Kumar Mittal)
Judge

14.7.2015

PARAMJIT