

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 15689 of 2014

Date of Decision: 21.7.2015

Sh. Ravinder Gupta and another

....Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Haryana and another

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. A.R. Takkar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sudeep Mahajan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. Through the instant petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the notifications dated 15.11.2002 (Annexure P-3) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 12.11.2003 (Annexure P-5) under Section 6 of the Act and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom including the award dated 18.11.2005 (Annexure P-11) qua their land situated in village Narsingpur, Tehsil and District Gurgaon, 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 of the land measuring 22 kanal 7 marlas to the extent of 1/4 share measuring 5

kanal 12 marlas situated in village Narsingpur, Tehsil and District Gurgaon. Government of Haryana issued a notification dated 15.11.2002 (Annexure P-3) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 12.11.2003 (Annexure P-5) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land including the land of the petitioners for the public purpose, namely, for the development of integrated complex for industrial, institutional, commercial, recreational and other public utilities in village Begumpur Khatola, Narsingpur and Khandsa, Tehsil and District Gurgaon. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act on 12.12.2002 (Annexure P-4). The petitioners challenged the said notifications by filing CWP No. 1269 of 2004 which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 16.7.2005 (Annexure P-7). In pursuance thereto, the petitioners filed a representation before the High Powered Committee for release of their land. The Chief Town Planner vide letter dated 10.10.2005 (Annexure P-8) called upon the petitioner to appear before the committee on 18.10.2005. In the meantime, the petitioners received notices, Annexure P-9, under Section 9 of the Act. The petitioners filed reply, Annexure P-10, to the said notices. The award was passed on 18.11.2005 (Annexure P-11). 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

July 21, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE