

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 11462 of 2015

Date of Decision: 28.5.2015

Parwati Devi

....Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate for the petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. In this petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the notifications dated 9.11.1992 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") and dated 6.11.1993 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land measuring 2 kanal 13 marlas situated within the revenue estate of village Sultanpur, Tehsil and District Sonapat. Further, a writ of mandamus has been sought directing the respondents to release the land in question.

2. Government of Haryana vide notification dated 9.11.1992 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 6.11.1993 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act, acquired the land including the land of the petitioner for the public purpose, i.e. for the development and utilization of land as residential and commercial area

for Sectors 3 and 7, HUDA, Sonapat. The petitioner challenged the said notifications by way of CWP No. 18257 of 1995 which was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 5.11.1996 (Annexure P-4). One of the co-sharers, namely, Kishore Chhabra filed CWP No. 17307 of 2011 challenging the acquisition proceedings and the said writ petition was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 15.9.2011. Against the said order dated 15.9.2011, SLP No. 28411 of 2011 filed by said Kishore Chhabra is still pending adjudication. The petitioner also filed CWP No. 20863 of 2013 and this Court vide order dated 19.9.2013 disposed of the said writ petition with a direction to the respondents to decide the legal notice of the petitioner by passing a speaking order. The petitioner sent a legal notice dated 5.11.2014 (Annexure P-5) to the respondents for the release of the land in view of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, but to no avail. The petitioner is still in physical possession of the land in dispute. No compensation has been paid to her. According to the petitioners, the acquisition proceedings have 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"). Hence, the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is in physical possession of the land in dispute and compensation has not been paid to her. 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 petitioner 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 petitioner, 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 petitioner 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 petitioner 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 her within a period of four months from the date of receipt of representation. The petitioner shall be entitled to lead any evidence to substantiate her 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 28, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE