

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 14776 of 2015

Date of Decision: 23.7.2015

Santosh Kumari

....Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Haryana and another

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Vikram Singh, 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 notification dated 23.2.1989 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") and dated 22.2.1990 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act vide which her land has been acquired. Further, a direction has been sought to the respondents to release the land of the petitioner 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. Respondent No.1 issued a notification dated 23.2.1989 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 22.2.1990 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of

land including the land of the petitioner for the development and utilization of land for residential and commercial area for Sectors 13 and 17, Panipat. The award was passed on 21.2.1992. The petitioner moved a representation dated 14.2.2015 (Annexure P-3) for release of the land in question in view of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, but to no effect. She is still in physical possession of the land in question. No compensation has been paid to her. Therefore, 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 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 comprehensive 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

July 23, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE