

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 10695 of 2014

Date of Decision: 21.5.2015

Ramesh Kumar and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Anil Dutt, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Palika Monga, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Ajay Kumar Kansal, Advocate for respondent No.3.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. The petitioners have approached this Court by way of instant petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the acquisition initiated vide notifications dated 20.1.2003 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") and dated 16.1.2004 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act, 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 in possession to the extent of their share of their agriculture land measuring 40 kanal 18 marlas

situated within the revenue estate of village Raipur, Tehsil and District Sonapat. State of Haryana vide notifications dated 20.1.2003 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 16.1.2004 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act, acquired their land for the development of residential and commercial Sectors 8 and 19, Sonapat. The award was passed on 14.1.2006. 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 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 two months 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

May 21, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE