

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

RFA No. 2501 of 2002 (O&M)

Date of decision : 3.11.2015

Ruldo and others

..... Appellants

VS

Union of India and others

..... Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. R. K. Dhiman, Mr. Hardip Singh, Advocates,
for the landowners.

Mr. Varun Issar, Advocate, for U. T. Chandigarh.

Rajesh Bindal J.

This order will dispose of RFA Nos. 2501, 2927 and 4148 of 2002, as the same arise out of common acquisition.

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

Briefly, the facts of the case are that vide notification dated 6.4.1992, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), the Chandigarh Administration sought to acquire land situated within the revenue estate of villages Dadu Majra and Dhanas, Union Territory, Chandigarh, for providing accommodation to the Jawans of 20 Coys of para Military Forces. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 31.7.1992. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector') vide award no. 476 dated 23.3.1993, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 2,00,000/- per acre for levelled land and ₹ 75,000/- per acre for gair mumkin nadi/nala kind of land. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference under Section 18 of the Act, the learned Court below assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 4,57,800/- per acre for the levelled land and ₹ 1,71,675/- per acre for gair mumkin nadi/ nala kind of land. It is this award which is impugned in the present appeals.

Learned counsel for the parties submitted that the claim in the present appeals is squarely covered by the judgment of this court in RFA No. 2323 of 2000 Surinder Singh vs Union Territory, Chandigarh, decided on 1.9.2008, whereby the award of the learned Court below was upheld.

Since the award of the learned Court below was upheld by this Court in Surinder Singh's case (supra), no case for enhancement of compensation is made out. Accordingly, the appeals are dismissed.

3.11.2015
vs.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge