

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 7383 of 2015

Date of Decision: 22.4.2015

Paras Ram

....Petitioner.

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 petitioner.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. By way of instant petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release his house 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"). Further, a prayer has been made for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the notifications dated 24.8.2000 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 22.8.2001 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 21.7.2003 (Annexure P-3).
2. The petitioner is owner in possession of the land situated at village Tigra, Tehsil and District Gurgaon. Government of Haryana vide

notification dated 24.8.2000 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 22.8.2001 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act acquired the land of various villages including that of the petitioner for public purpose, i.e., for the development and utilization of land for residential, commercial and institutional area, Sector 57, Gurgaon. The petitioner filed objection under Section 5-A of the Act. The award was passed on 21.7.2003 (Annexure P-3). After passing of the award, the respondents released vacant land of Shri Rameshwar vide release order dated 30.10.2006 (Annexure P-4). The petitioner approached the authorities to release his land but to no effect. The petitioner is still in physical possession of the land in dispute and has not withdrawn the amount of compensation. 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for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is still in physical possession of the land in dispute and has not withdrawn the amount of compensation. 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 petitioner, 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.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

April 22, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE