

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

RFA No.4616 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.12.2015

Jagdish and others

..... Appellants

Versus

Haryana State and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Aggarwal, Advocate and
Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Advocate, for the appellants.

Ms. Vibha Tewari, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

RAJESH BINDAL, J

This order will dispose of two appeals bearing RFA Nos.4616 and 7027 of 2015, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein.

The landowners are in appeal before this court against the award of the learned court below seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts are that vide notification dated 20.6.2005, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), the land situated in the area of Village Wazirabad, Tehsil and District Gurgaon, was sought to be acquired by the State of Haryana for residential, commercial, institutional and open space for Sectors 52A, 53 and 54, Gurgaon. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 19.6.2006. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector'), vide award No.45 dated 22.2.2007, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 15,00,000/- per acre. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference under Section 18 of the Act, the learned court below, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 2,724/- per square yard. The same have been impugned by the landowners in the present appeals seeking further enhancement.

Learned counsel for the landowners submitted that the claim made in the present set of appeals is squarely covered by judgment of this Court in RFA No. 1235 of 2011 – Chhatter and others v. Haryana State and others, decided on 10.12.2015, whereby compensation for the land acquired vide same notification was further enhanced.

Learned counsel for the State did not dispute the aforesaid factual position.

Accordingly, for the reasons recorded in Chhatter's case (supra), the appeals are disposed of in the same terms.

(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE

24.12.2015

sharmila