

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

RFA No. 1202 of 2005 (O&M)
LAC No. 5 of 3.1.2001

Date of decision : 19.11.2015

Darshan Singh and others

.. Appellants

versus

Punjab State and others

.. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Harkaran Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Bhalla, Advocate, for the appellants.
Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Rajesh Bindal J.

The landowners have filed the present appeal seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts of the case are that State of Punjab, vide notification dated 20.4.1988, published on 25.4.1988, issued under Section 4 of the the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), sought to acquire land of Villages Khakh, Akbarpur and Goindwal, Tehsil Tarn Taran, District Amritsar, for setting up Industrial Complex at Goindwal. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 29.8.1988. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector') vide award no.2 dated 30.8.1990 assessed compensation of the acquired land @ ₹ 40,000/- per acre for chahi of villages Khakh and Goindwal and ₹ 15,000/- per acre for gair mumkin and banjar kadim kinds of land of villages Khakh and Akbarpur. The landowner feeling dissatisfied with the amount of compensation awarded by the Collector, filed objections. On reference, the learned court below vide award dated 13.12.2004, dismissed the reference petition of the appellants. It is this award which has been impugned in the present appeal.

Learned counsel for the appellants submitted that the issue involved in the present appeal is squarely covered by judgment of this Court

in RA No. 99/CI of 2014 in RFA No. 4241 of 2006 Vijay and another vs State of Punjab and others, decided on 27.2.2015, whereby the compensation for the acquired land was assessed @ ₹ 110/- per square yard.

Learned counsel for the State did not dispute the aforesaid factual position.

For the reasons mentioned in Vijay's case (supra), the present appeal is disposed of in the same terms.

19.11.2015

vs.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge