

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 1000 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.7.2015

Diwan Singh and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL.  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL.**

PRESENT: Ms. Gaganjot, Advocate for  
Mr. Pavan Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sudeep Mahajan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana with  
Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG, Haryana.

**AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.**

**CM No. 8457 of 2015**

This is an application under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with order 9 Rule 9 of the Code of Civil Procedure for restoration of the writ petition. The application is supported by an affidavit of Mr. Pavan Malik, Advocate.

For the reasons mentioned in the application which is supported by an affidavit of the counsel, the writ petition is restored to its original number. CM stands disposed of accordingly.

**CWP No. 1000 of 2015**

1. In this petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have prayed for issuance of a writ in

the nature of certiorari for quashing the notifications dated 28.3.1985 (Annexure P-14) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 16.1.1986 (Annexure P-15) under Section 6 of the Act and the consequent proceedings including the award dated 14.1.1988 (Annexure P-16), having lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as "2013 Act").

2. The petitioners are owners of their respective shares in the land measuring 4 bigha 19 biswas. Government of Haryana vide notification dated 28.3.1985 (Annexure P-14) issued under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 16.1.1986 (Annexure P-15) under Section 6 of the Act, acquired the land including the land of the petitioners. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act. The award was passed on 14.1.1988 (Annexure P-16). The petitioners are still in physical possession of the land in question. No compensation has been paid to them. According to the petitioners, the acquisition proceedings have lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are still in physical possession of the land in dispute and compensation has not been paid to them. It was claimed that in such circumstances, in view of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, the notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the Act had lapsed. It was further submitted that since no demand notice claiming the relief as claimed in respect of lapse of notifications has been filed with the respondents, liberty be granted to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive

representation before the appropriate authority by incorporating the grievance as raised in the present writ petition, however, direction be issued to the authority concerned to decide the representation expeditiously in a time bound manner in accordance with law.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, perusing the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we dispose of the present petition by granting liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all the pleas as raised in the present writ petition before the appropriate authority. It is directed that in the event of a representation being filed by the petitioners within a period of one month from today, the same shall be decided in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to them within a period of four months from the date of receipt of representation. The petitioners shall be entitled to lead any evidence to substantiate their claim before the concerned authority. Till the matter is decided by the said authority, status quo shall be maintained by the parties. It is, however, made clear that in case no such representation is filed within the stipulated period as noticed above, the interim order shall cease to operate, thereafter.

**(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 29, 2015**  
gbs

**(REKHA MITTAL)**  
**JUDGE**