

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 906 of 2015

Date of Decision: 14.7.2015

Baldev Raj Juneja and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Amit Jain, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 petitioners have prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to compute and pay the compensation to them 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. Government of Haryana issued a notification dated 1.10.1973 (Annexure P-3) under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") followed by notification dated 6.10.1975 (Annexure P-4) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land including the land of the petitioners for the development and utilization of

land as residential areas in Sectors 18 and 19, Faridabad-Ballabgarh controlled area. The award was passed on 8.2.1979 (Annexure P-5). 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 compensation has not been paid to the petitioners. 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 comprehensive 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 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.

**(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

July 14, 2015
gbs

**(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE**