

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 15857 of 2015

Date of Decision: 4.8.2015

Hukam Singh and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL.
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEKHER DHAWAN.**

PRESENT: Mr. Mukesh Rao, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 30.3.1990 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short “the Act”), dated 27.3.1991 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 24.3.1993, 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 29 kanal 15 marlas situated within the revenue estate of Rewari. Government of Haryana issued a notification dated 30.3.1990 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated

27.3.1991 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land of the petitioners for the public purpose, namely, residential and commercial. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act. The petitioners challenged the said acquisition by way of CWP No. 4977 of 1993 which was disposed of by this Court vide a common order dated 13.7.1998 (Annexure P-3 Colly). In pursuance thereto, the respondents vide order dated 7.8.2000 (Annexure P-4) released the land of the petitioners measuring 12 kanal 9 marlas and intkal dated 9.12.2006 (Annexure P-5) in their favour was got entered. The District Town Planner, Rewari vide letter dated 29.1.1999 (Annexure P-6) recommended for the release of the land under acquisition. The award was passed on 24.3.1993. 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 petitioners, 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

August 4, 2015
gbs

(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE