

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 17405 of 2014

Date of Decision: 20.7.2015

Ramlal and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Sunish Bindlish, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Palika Monga, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Atul Aggarwal, Advocate for respondent No.3.

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 mandamus declaring that acquisition initiated vide notifications dated 20.1.2003 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short “the Act”), dated 16.1.2004 (Annexure P-3) and the award dated 14.1.2006 (Annexure P-5) qua the land situated in village Nangal Khurd, Hadbast No.89, Tehsil and District Sonapat, shall be deemed to have lapsed 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. Government of Haryana vide notification dated 20.1.2003

(Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 16.1.2004 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act, acquired the land of the petitioners. The award was passed on 14.1.2006 (Annexure P-5). Petitioners No.1 to 7 have already sold the land to petitioner No.8 who vide letter dated 11.7.2008 (Annexure P-6) apprised respondent No.2 regarding the said fact. The respondents vide letter dated 6.8.2008 (Annexure P-7) informed petitioner No.8 that no compensation has been paid in respect of the land in question. Petitioner No.8 filed a suit for declaration which was decreed by the trial court to the extent that petitioner No.8 is entitled to receive the entire compensation in the suit property. They are still in physical possession of the land in dispute and 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 20, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE