

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 9236 of 2015

Date of Decision: 12.5.2015

Anita and another

...Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Vikram Punia, 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 certiorari for quashing the notifications dated 22.6.2006 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 20.6.2007 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 28.11.2008 (Annexure P-3) qua their land.

2. Government of Haryana vide notification dated 22.6.2006 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 20.6.2007 (Annexure P-2) under Section 6 of the Act acquired 476 acres 5 kanal and 17 marlas of land including the land of the petitioners for the development of industrial Sector 38 in the revenue estate of villages Badh Malik, Badh Khalsa, Jatheri, Liwan, Pritampura and Rai, Tehsil and District Sonapat. The award was passed on 28.11.2008

(Annexure P-3). According to the petitioners, the acquisition proceedings have 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") as they are still in physical possession of the land in question and no compensation has been paid to them. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are in physical possession of the land in dispute and compensation has not been paid to the them. However, the compensation was deposited in the Court only on 30.1.2015, i.e. after more than 6 years and 2 months of the passing of the award. 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.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

May 12, 2015
gbs

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE