

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 3280 of 2015

Date of Decision: 30.7.2015

Rakesh Batra

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Kirpal Singh Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

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 16.12.1988 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 14.12.1989 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 8.10.2001 (Annexure P-7), 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").

2. The respondents issued a notification dated 16.12.1988 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 14.12.1989 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of

land of the petitioner measuring 11 bigha 13 biswas situated in village Khandsa, Tehsil and District Gurgaon. The petitioner challenged the said acquisition by way of CWP No. 9141 of 1990 which was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 16.5.2001 (Annexure P-3) against which the petitioner filed LPA No. 1532 of 2001. The said LPA was also dismissed by this Court vide order dated 23.7.2001 (Annexure P-4). Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner filed SLP (Civil) No. 16033 of 2001 against the LPA order, Annexure P-4, and the Supreme Court vide order dated 19.10.2001 (Annexure P-5) stayed the operation of the order dated 23.7.2001 (Annexure P-4) and also stayed the dispossession of the petitioner from the land in question. However, the SLP was dismissed as withdrawn by the Apex Court vide order dated 1.9.2009 (Annexure P-6). The award was passed on 8.10.2001 (Annexure P-7). The petitioner 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 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 30, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE