

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

**R.F.A No. 3694 of 2007 (O&M)**

Date of decision :14.12.2015

Union Territory, Chandigarh

..... Appellant

VS

Pritam Singh

.... Respondent

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal**

**Present:** Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate and  
Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate, for the appellant.

**Rajesh Bindal J.**

Union Territory, Chandigarh is in appeal seeking reduction in the compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts are that vide notification dated 1.9.2000, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), Union Territory, Chandigarh sought to acquire land measuring 4½ marlas situated within the revenue estate village Khuda Ali Sher, Union Territory, Chandigarh, for erection of tower railing with overhead 66 KV power line. The same was followed by notification issued under Section 6 of the Act dated 10.1.2001. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, "the Collector") vide award No.537/LAO dated 12.8.2001 assessed the market value of the acquired @ ₹ 5,77,152/- per acre. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowner filed objections. On reference, the learned court below, vide award dated 6.2.2007 determined market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 17,20,500/- per acre. It is this award which has been impugned by Union Territory, Chandigarh before this court.

The acquired land in the present case is merely 4½ marlas. It was acquired for the purpose of erection of tower railing with overhead 66 KV power line. The amount of compensation as assessed by the

Collector @ ₹ 5,77,152/- per acre was increased to ₹ 17,20,500/- per acre. The land is located in the periphery of Chandigarh on the northern side.

Considering the fact that the land is merely a small portion measuring 4½ marlas, acquired about 15 years back and the amount of compensation has already been paid to the landowner, which will be quite small sum, I do not find any reason to interfere in the appeal filed by the U.T., Chandigarh seeking reduction of the compensation, accordingly, the same is dismissed.

14.12.2015

*sharmila*

**(Rajesh Bindal)**

**Judge**