

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

**Civil Misc. No. 8507/CI of 2015 and
RFA No. 4377 of 2015 (O&M)**

Date of decision : 22.9.2015

Mewa Singh

..... Appellant

vs

The State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate, for the appellant (s).

Rajesh Bindal, J

This order will dispose of RFA Nos. 4377 to 4382 of 2015, as the same arise out common acquisition.

By filing the present appeals, the landowners are seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land. Along with the appeal, application for condonation of delay of 25 years 361 days in filing thereof has also been filed.

Briefly the facts are that vide notification dated 12/19.9.1983 issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act') the State of Haryana sought to acquire land situated in the revenue estate of village Bohli, Tehsil Panipat, District Karnal, for setting up of refinery at Bohli by Indian Oil Corporation. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 29.3.1985. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, the Collector) vide award dated 26.3.1987 assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 20,000/- per acre for chahi/nehri, ₹ 10,000/- per acre for barani and ₹ 5,000/- per acre for banjar kind of land. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference, the learned court below rejected the claim of the landowners vide order dated 1.2.1989. Aggrieved against the award of learned Court below, the landowners are before this Court. Along with the appeal, an application

seeking condonation of delay of 25 years and 361 days in filing thereof has also been filed.

There is hardly any ground mentioned in the application seeking condonation of huge delay of 25 years and 361 days in filing the appeal. Hence, no case is made out for condonation of delay in filing the appeal. Accordingly, the application for condonation of delay in all the appeals is dismissed. Consequently, the appeals are also dismissed.

22.9.2015

vs.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge