

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

RFA No.2497 of 1996 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 3.9.2015

Shanti Devi and others

...Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Rajbir Sehrawat, Advocate, for the appellants.

Mr. Arun Beniwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

RAJESH BINDAL, J.

This order will dispose of three appeals bearing RFA Nos.2497, 2537 and 2539 of 1996, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein.

The landowners are in appeals seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts are that vide notification issued on 26.12.1988 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), the State of Haryana sought to acquire land in village Bohar, Tehsil and District Rohtak, for development and utilisation thereof as residential and commercial area in Sector-3, Rohtak. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 22.12.1989. Vide award dated 29.3.1990, the Land Acquisition Collector (for short, the Collector") assessed the compensation for the acquired land @ ₹ 64,000/- per acre for the land comprising in Rectangle Nos. 100, 101 and 129 to 132, ₹ 30/- per square yard for the land comprising in Rectangle Nos. 134 to 139; and ₹ 50/- per square yard for the land comprising in Rectangle Nos. 162 to 167. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference under Section 18 of the Act, the learned Court below vide award dated 1.8.1996 determined the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 55/- per square yard.

It is this award which is impugned in the present appeals by the landowners.

Learned counsel for the landowners submitted that the issue raised in the present set of appeals is squarely covered by judgment of this court in RFA No.3497 of 1993 Parchare vs Haryana State and another, decided on 5.11.2009.

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

Accordingly, for the reasons mentioned in Parchare's case (supra), the present appeals are disposed of in the same terms.

(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE

3.9.2015

sharmila