

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

RFA No. 1371 of 2002 (O&M)

Date of decision : 1.9.2015

Rohit and others

... Appellants

VS

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. S. P. Khatri, Advocate, for the appellants.

Mr. Abhinash Jain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

By filing appeal, the landowners are seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts are that vide notification dated 9.11.1992 and 6.11.1993, issued under Sections 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, the Act), the State of Haryana sought to acquire land situated in village Sultanpur, Hadbast No. 80, Tehsil and District Sonapat, for the development and utilisation thereof as residential, commercial area alongwith Sector Road at Sonapat. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, the Collector) vide award dated 5.11.1995, determined the market value of the land @ ₹ 3 lacs per acre for the area falling on both sides of the Sonapat-Bahalgarh road upto four acres; ₹ 2 lacs per acre for chahi/ nehri and ₹ 1 lac per acre for gair mumkin/ banjar and remaining land. Aggrieved against the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference, the learned Court below determined the value of the land @ ₹ 100/- per square yard for chahi/ nehri and ₹ 60/- per acre for gair mumkin/ banjar kinds of land. It is this award which is impugned in the present appeal.

Learned counsel for the landowners submitted that the claim made in the present appeal is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in RFA No. 2453 of 2000 - Smt.Chanderpati and others vs State of Haryana and others, decided on 30.5.2007, whereby the amount of compensation payable to the landowners was assessed @ ₹ 200/- per square yard.

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

For the detailed reasons recorded in Smt. Chanderpati's case (supra), the present appeal is disposed of in the same terms.

1.9.2015
vs.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge