

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 21739 of 2014

Date of Decision: 9.7.2015

Krishan Kumar and another

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Navneet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Palika Monga, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 5.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. Written statement on behalf of respondents No.2 and 5 filed today in Court is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

2. By way of 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 22.6.2006 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") and dated 20.6.2007 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act qua their land. Further, a writ of mandamus has been sought direction the respondents to release the land of the petitioners from acquisition.

2. The petitioners and Smt. Kasturi Devi are co-sharers in the land situated within the revenue estate of village Badh Malik, Tehsil and

District Sonapat. State of Haryana issued a notification dated 22.6.2006 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 20.6.2007 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of 3813 kanal 17 marlas of land of villages Badh Malik, Jatheri, Liwan, Pritampura and Rail including the land of the petitioners. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act. They filed CWP No. 16111 of 2007 challenging the acquisition of their land which was dismissed by this Court and the SLP preferred thereto was also dismissed by the Supreme Court. The award was passed on 28.11.2008. The petitioners are still in physical possession of the land in question 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 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.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are in physical possession of the land in dispute and no compensation has 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.

5. 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 9, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE