

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 19907 of 2014

Date of Decision: 11.5.2015

Meena Aggarwal

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Avnish Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Raman Gaur, 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 9.11.1992 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 6.11.1993 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. The petitioner is owner in possession of the land measuring about 4700 square yards in District Sonapat. The respondents issued a notification dated 9.11.1992 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 6.11.1993 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land of the petitioner for the development and

utilization of the land as residential and commercial area along with sector road at Sonapat. The award was passed on 5.11.1995. The petitioner filed reference under Section 18 of the Act which was decided vide award dated 10.8.2001. Against the said award, respondent No.1 filed RFA No. 1146 of 2002 whereas the petitioner filed an appeal for enhancement of the compensation and this Court vide order dated 30.7.2008 disposed of all the appeals. She is still in physical possession of the land in question. No compensation has been paid to her. According to the petitioner, the acquisition proceedings 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"). 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 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 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

May 11, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE