

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 25023 of 2014

Date of Decision: 28.7.2015

Rajinder and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sudeep Mahajan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana with
Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG, Haryana.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. In this 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 27.1.2003 (Annexure P-2A) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 23.1.2004 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 20.1.2006 (Annexure P-4), 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 cultivating possession of the land measuring 8 kanal 5 marlas situated within the revenue estate of village Piwra, Tehsil and District Rewari. Government of Haryana issued

a notification dated 27.1.2003 (Annexure P-2A) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 23.1.2004 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land including the land of the petitioners for the development and utilization of land for residential, commercial Sectors 18, 19 and 20 Part, commercial Sector 17, Part at Rewari. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act. The petitioners challenged the said acquisition by filing CWP No. 4927 of 2006 which was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 14.2.2008 in terms of CWP No. 732 of 2006. The award was passed on 20.1.2006 (Annexure P-4). The land of the petitioners comprised in khasra No. 15//14/2 (5K-4M) has been released along with other land under Section 48 of the Act. They are still in physical possession of the land in question and are ready to refund the amount of compensation received by 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 are ready to refund the amount of compensation received by 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 28, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE