

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

RFA No. 1678 of 2000 (O&M)

Date of decision : 11.12.2015

Bant Singh and others

..... Appellants

VS

Union Territory, Chandigarh

..... Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. P. C. Dhiman, Advocate and
Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate, for the appellants.

Mr. Deepak Sharma and Mr. Ashish Rawal, Advocates,
for the respondent- U.T. Chandigarh.

Rajesh Bindal J.

This order will dispose of RFA Nos. 1678, 1787 and 2009 of 2000, as the same arise out of common acquisition.

The landowners are in appeal before this court against the award of the learned court below seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts are that vide notification dated 9.3.1989, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), the Chandigarh Administration sought to acquire land situated in the revenue estate of Village Hallo Majra for setting up of Nucleus Centre. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 30.3.1989. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector') vide award no.421 dated 24.4.1990 assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 1,65,400/- per acre for all kinds of land. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference, the learned court below vide award dated 14.3.2000, determined the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 4,35,600/- per acre. Dissatisfied with the award of the learned court below, the landowners are before this court.

Learned counsel for the appellants submitted that the issue raised in the present set of appeals is squarely covered by judgment of this Court RFA No. 1298 of 1996 Bachhittar Singh and others vs Union Territory, Chandigarh decided on 19.9.2008 where for the land acquired vide notification dated 13.06.1989 located close to the acquired land in question, this Court awarded compensation @ ₹ 3,31,520/- per acre.

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

For the reasons recorded in Bachhittar Singh's case (supra), the present appeals are disposed of in the same terms.

11.12.2015

vs.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge