

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 2910 of 2015

Date of Decision: 11.5.2015

Chattar Pal and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Manish Mehta, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Rajesh Malik, Advocate for respondent No.3.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. Affidavit of Rajender Kumar Gahlot, Land Acquisition Collector, Urban Estates, Haryana, Faridabad filed on behalf of respondent No.2 today in Court is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

2. 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 mandamus declaring and holding that the acquisition proceedings initiated vide notifications dated 2.8.1989 issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") and dated 1.8.1990 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act qua their land measuring 1 kanal 2 marlas situated within the revenue estate of village

Mewla Maharajpur, Tehsil Ballabgarh, District Faridabad, having 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").

3. State of Haryana issued a notification dated 2.8.1989 under Section 4 of the Act for acquisition of the land situated in the revenue estate of Mewla Maharajpur, Tehsil Ballabgarh, District Faridabad for the development and utilization of land as residential and commercial, Sector 45, Faridabad Ballabgarh Controlled area. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act on 31.8.1989 (Annexure P-1). Thereafter, notification dated 1.8.1990 (Annexure P-2) was issued under Section 6 of the Act. Notice dated 17.1.1991 (Annexure P-3) under Section 9 of the Act was issued to the petitioners. The petitioners and other landowners filed CWP No. 1704 of 1991 for quashing of the said notifications and this Court vide order dated 3.8.2010 dismissed the said writ petition. The award was passed on 7.10.1991. The petitioners are still in physical possession of the land in question. 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.

4. 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.

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

May 11, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE