

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

**Date of decision:10.8.2015**

**1. CWP No.6398 of 2006(O&M)**

**Amandeep Singh Chatha and others ....Petitioners**

**VERSUS**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**2. CWP No.6399 of 2006(O&M)**

**Gurdev Singh and others ....Petitioners**

**VERSUS**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**3. CWP No.5907 of 2006(O&M)**

**Sampuran Singh and others ....Petitioners**

**VERSUS**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA**

**HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAJ RAHUL GARG**

**Present: Mr. H.S. Grewal, Advocate for the petitioners.**

**Mr. Manoj Bajaj, Additional A.G. Punjab.**

**Mr. R.S. Khosla, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Aman Sharma, Advocate for PUDA/GMADA.**

**\*\*\*\*\***

**HEMANT GUPTA, J.(Oral)**

**This order shall dispose of three writ petitions bearing  
CWP Nos.6398, 6399 and 5907 of 2006 challenging acquisition of**

land vide notification dated 21.03.2005 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act') followed by notification dated 13.03.2006 under Section 6 of the Act. This Court has granted an ad interim protection regarding dispossession on 27.04.2006.

Learned counsel for the respondent has pointed out that the arguments raised in the present writ petitions were also raised in another set of petitions i.e. CWP No.9060 of 2005 titled Amarjit Singh and others v. State of Punjab and others, which has since been dismissed on 26.09.2006. Review application was also dismissed on 09.02.2007. Even the Special Leave Petition against the said order is stated to be dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners does not dispute that the issues raised in the present writ petitions are common with the aforesaid writ petition but argued that in CWP No.6398 of 2006, petrol pump is subject matter of acquisition, whereas in CWP No.6399 of 2006 it is a cold storage which is subject matter of acquisition. Since both the writ petitions relate to acquisition of land and on which the petitioners are dependant for their livelihood, therefore, the same should not be allowed to be made subject matter of acquisition.

We do not find any merit in the said argument. The acquisition of land would deprive the landowner of the land and also of the dependence on such land for livelihood. The consequence of acquisition is payment of compensation which will allow the landowner for alternative vocation in life.

Since the issues on merits stands concluded against the petitioners in CWP No.9060 of 2005, we do not find any merit in the

all the writ petitions and the same are thus, dismissed in the same terms as CWP No.9060 of 2005.

**(HEMANT GUPTA)**  
**JUDGE**

**AUGUST 10, 2015**  
‘D. Gulati’

**(RAJ RAHUL GARG)**  
**JUDGE**