

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

CWP No. 3595 of 2008

DATE OF DECISION : 18.12.2015

Baljit Singh and others

.... PETITIONERS

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... RESPONDENTS

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEKHER DHAWAN

Present: Mr. Surender Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

* * *

SATISH KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

In the present writ petition, the petitioners have challenged the Notifications dated 19.10.2001 (Annexure P-1) and 18.10.2002 (Annexure P-2) issued under Sections 4 and 6, respectively, of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, as well as the awards dated 14.10.2004 (Annexures P-3 and P-4), acquiring the land in question owned and possessed by the petitioners.

On the last date of hearing, i.e. on 10.12.2015, the following order was passed by this court :-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners states that the notification of acquisition in this case is the same as in CWP No. 1533 of 2009. He further states that let this petition be also disposed of in

terms of the order passed today in CWP No. 1533 of 2009. Learned counsel for the respondents - State seeks time to have instructions in the matter. Adjourned to December 18, 2015."

Today, learned counsel for the respondents – State, on instructions, states that the issue raised in this petition is squarely covered by the order dated 10.12.2015, passed in CWP No. 1533 of 2009 (Fateh Singh and others Versus State of Haryana and others), vide which the said writ petition as well as two other connected petitions (CWP Nos. 18645 and 19357 of 2014) were dismissed as having become infructuous, while observing as under :-

"Today, learned State counsel has filed affidavit dated 09.12.2015 duly sworn by the Land Acquisition Collector, Urban Estate, Rohtak, on behalf of respondent No.3. In paragraph 4 of the affidavit, it has been stated that in view of the provision of Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013, the Government has taken a decision to pay compensation to the beneficiaries in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 2013. It has been further stated in the said affidavit that keeping in view the said decision and provision of Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013, the revised award has been pronounced on 28.10.2015, awarding compensation at the rate of ₹ 73,86,771/- per acre, including all benefits as per the Act of 2013. Though copy of the award

has not been annexed with the affidavit, but learned State counsel submits that copy of the award will be sent to the petitioners forthwith.

In view of the aforesaid affidavit and the revised award pronounced under the provisions of the Act of 2013, at present, all these petitions have become infructuous.

Consequently, all these petitions are dismissed as having become infructuous.

However, if any of the petitioner/petitioners is/are not satisfied with quantum of the compensation awarded under the revised award, it will be open for him/her to avail the remedy in accordance with law.”

In view of the aforesaid position, this petition is also dismissed as having become infructuous, in terms of the order dated 10.12.2015 passed in CWP No. 1533 of 2009 (Fateh Singh and others Versus State of Haryana and others).

**(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

December 18, 2015
ndj

**(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE**