

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 5032 of 2015

Date of Decision: 19.3.2015

Kishan Lal 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. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 mandamus directing the respondents to release their house in terms 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 20.4.1990 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") followed by notification dated 18.4.1991 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act and award was passed on 23.3.1993 for acquisition of land of the petitioners for the public purpose, i.e. for residential, commercial, institutional and recreational zone and open space in Sectors 44, 45 and 46 at Gurgaon. The petitioners also sent

objections under Section 5-A of the Act. They have submitted applications for releasing of their property from the acquisition as the respondents have released the properties of the other land owners after passing the award in the same village and from the same notification vide releasing orders dated 18.12.2002, 26.6.2012 and 22.8.2012 (Annexures P-4 to P-6, respectively). They are still in physical possession of the land in question. 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 house in dispute. 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 petitioners, 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 one month 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.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

March 19, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE