

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

RFA No. 1840 of 1996 (O&M)

Date of decision : 20.8.2015

State of Haryana and another

.. Appellants

versus

Kartar Singh and others

.. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Abhinash Jain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Arun K. Singal, Advocate, for respondent no. 4.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

The State is in appeal seeking reduction of compensation awarded to the landowners for the acquired land.

Brief facts of the case are that vide notification dated 18.5.1989, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short "the Act"), land measuring 372.26 acres situated in villages Kabri, Faridpur, Sarain Bachhra, Patti Magdum Jadgan and Patti Taraf Insar, Tehsil and District Panipat was sought to be acquired by the State of Haryana for the development and utilization thereof as residential, commercial, industrial and institutional areas in Sectors-6, 7 & 8, Panipat. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 9.5.1990. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short "the Collector") vide award no.4 assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 2,00,000/- per acre. The landowners and tenants feeling dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, filed reference under Sections 18 and 30 of the Act. The learned court below determined the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 81/- per square yard. Aggrieved against the award of learned Court below assessing compensation, the State is before this Court.

Learned counsel for respondent no. 4 submitted that the claim made in the present appeal is squarely covered with the judgment of this court in RFA No. 2213 of 1995 Kasturi Lal and others Vs. The State of

Haryana and another decided on 27.5.2009, whereby the compensation payable to the land owners has been enhanced further to ₹ 139/- per square yard.

Learned counsel for the State did not dispute the aforesaid factual statement.

Since this court had further enhanced the compensation for the acquired land, the claim of the State for reduction does not survive.

Accordingly, for the reasons recorded in Kasturi Lal's case (supra), the present appeal is dismissed.

20.8.2015
vs

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge