

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

RFA No. 985 of 1999 (O&M)
Date of decision : 4.11.2015

Gurdas Chand

... Appellant

vs

State of Haryana and another

.. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Rajesh Goyal, Advocate for
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate, for the appellant.
Mr. Arun Beniwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

This order will dispose of a bunch of appeals bearing RFA No. 985 to 989, 1590, 1650, 1916 and 1917 of 1999, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein. However, the facts have been extracted from RFA No.985 of 1999.

By filing the appeal, the landowner is seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts of the case are that vide notification issued on 10.7.1987, under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), State of Haryana sought to acquire land situated within the revenue estate of village Jhandola, Hadbast No.149, Tehsil Thanesar, District Kurukshetra, for construction of road from village Jhandola to village Sangaur via Mahwa Kheri. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 10.5.1988. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, the Collector) vide his award dated 20.12.1989 assessed the compensation @ ₹ 28,000/- per acre for Chahi and ₹ 7,000/- per acre for Gair Mumkin Sarak & Nadi kind of land. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the land owner filed objections. On reference under Section 18 of the Act, the

learned court below assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 44,800/- per acre for Chahi land and ₹ 13,000/- per acre for Gair mumkin Sarak and Nadi land. This award has been impugned in the present set of appeals by the landowners.

Learned counsel for the appellants submitted that the claim made in the present set of appeals is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in RFA No.284 of 1999—Randeep Singh and others v. State of Haryana and another, decided on 29.1.2014.

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

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

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

4.11.2015

sharmila