

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 174 of 2015

Date of Decision: 2.7.2015

Sehdev Singh

....Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Ajay Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vishal Garg, Advocate for respondent No.2.

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 notifications dated 30.10.1992 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 28.10.1993 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 26.10.1995 (Annexure P-4) whereby his land has been acquired, 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 petitioner is owner in possession of a plot measuring 800 square yards situated within the revenue estate of Narnaul, District

Mahendergarh and raised 'A' class construction thereon prior to the issuance of notification under Section 4 of the Act. Government of Haryana issued a notification dated 30.10.1992 (Annexure P-2) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 28.10.1993 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of 184.56 acres of land including the land of the petitioner for the development and utilization of land for setting up Mini Urban Estate at Narnaul. The award was announced on 26.10.1995 (Annexure P-4). The petitioner filed CWP No. 13648 of 1995 which was disposed of by this Court along with connected writ petitions vide order dated 13.8.1998 (Annexure P-6) in pursuance to the report dated 13.2.1998 (Annexure P-5) submitted by the Joint Inspection Committee. He is still in physical possession of the land in question. No compensation has been paid to him. According to the petitioner, 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 him. 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 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 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 him within a period of four months from the date of receipt of representation. The petitioner shall be entitled to lead any evidence to substantiate his 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 2, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE