

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 8681 of 2015

Date of Decision: 5.5.2015

Smt. Rajeshwari Devi 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. Sanjay Vashisth, Advocate for the petitioners.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. By way of instant 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 seeking declaration to the effect that the acquisition proceedings qua the land in question stand 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"). Further, a prayer has been made for quashing the notifications dated 30.1.1989 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 25.1.1990 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 15.4.2002 (Annexure P-6).
2. The petitioners are in possession of the land measuring 3 kanal 6 marlas qua their respective shares situated in village Silokhra,

Tehsil and District Gurgaon and had constructed a house before the issuance of notification under Section 4 of the Act. Government of Haryana vide notification dated 30.1.1989 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 25.1.1990 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act acquired the land of the petitioners for development and utilization of land as institutional, residential, commercial and industrial area in Sector 30, HUDA, Gurgaon. The petitioners along with other shareholders filed CWP No. 6130 of 1990 (Annexure P-4) and the said writ petition was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 25.7.2000 (Annexure P-7) in terms of order dated 29.3.1995 (Annexure P-8) passed in CWP No. 5900 of 1990. The award was passed on 15.4.2002 (Annexure P-6). 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.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are still 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.

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 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 5, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE