

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

RFA No. 6934 of 2011 (O&M)

Date of decision : 5.11.2015

Navjit Singh Brar and others

.. Appellants

versus

The Union Territory of Chandigarh

.. Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate, for the landowners.

Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate, for U. T. Chandigarh.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

This order will dispose of RFA Nos. 6934 and 6950 of 2011, as the same arise out of common acquisition.

By filing appeals, the landowners are seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts are that vide notification dated 31.1.1992, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), the Chandigarh Administration sought to acquire 54.58 acres of land situated in Mani Majra, Union Territory, Chandigarh, for development of residential-cum-commercial Complex Scheme No.13, Mani Majra and for construction of College Building and Sports Stadium by the Notified Area Committee. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 29.1.1993. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector') vide award no.557 dated 5.3.2003 assessed the market value @ ₹ 3,50,000/- per acre. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference, the learned court below determined the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 196/- per square yard in award subject matter of appeal in RFA No. 6934 of 2011 and ₹ 4,35,600/- per acre subject matter of appeal in RFA No. 6950 of 2011. These awards have been impugned in both the appeals by the landowners.

Learned counsel for the landowners submitted that the issue raised in the present appeals is squarely covered by judgment of this Court in RFA No. 1920 of 2004 Union Territory, Chandigarh vs Puran Chand Gupta and others decided on 15.3.2010, whereby the compensation for the acquired land was further enhanced to ₹ 196/- per square yard.

Learned counsel for U. T. Chandigarh did not dispute the aforesaid factual position.

Accordingly, for the reasons recorded in Puran Chand Gupta's case (supra), the present set of appeals are disposed of in the same terms.

5.11.2015

vs

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge