

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 9124 of 2015

Date of Decision: 11.5.2015

Sanjay Kumar @ Sanjay Baba

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

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 2.3.1993 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act") and dated 1.3.1994 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act vide which his land has been acquired. Further, a writ of mandamus has been sought directing the respondents to release the land of the petitioner 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. Respondent No.1 issued a notification dated 2.3.1993 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 1.3.1994 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of

land of the petitioner for the development and utilization of land for residential and commercial area for Sector 17, Panipat. The petitioner moved a representation dated 10.10.2014 (Annexure P-4) to the respondents for release of the land in question in view of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act but to no effect. He 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 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. 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 11, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE