

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

RFA No. 4630 of 2015 (O&M)

LAC No. 57 of 2014

Date of decision : 7.9.2015

Gurnam Singh and another	vs	 Appellants
State of Haryana		 Respondent

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for Mr. Bhag Singh, Advocate,
for the landowners.

Mr. Arun Beniwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Rajesh Bindal J.

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 4.12.2000, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act'), the land situated in the area of Village Nanhera, Hadbast No. 104, Tehsil and District Ambala, was sought to be acquired by the State of Haryana for development and utilisation thereof as residential, commercial and industrial area for Sectors 10, 11 and 12, Part Ambala Cantt. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 3.12.2001. The award was announced by the Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector') on 11.9.2003, granting compensation @ ₹ 4,00,000/- per acre for the land falling in the vicinity of abadi of village upto the depth of 5 acres, ₹ 3,00,000/- per acre for chahi, ₹ 2,00,000/- per acre for barani, and ₹ 1,50,000/- per acre for gair mumkin/ banjar kinds of land. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the landowners filed objections. On reference, the learned court below vide award dated 7.7.2015 assessed the compensation for the acquired land @ ₹ 297/- per square yard. Aggrieved against the award of the learned Court below, the landowners are in appeal before this Court.

Learned counsel for the parties submitted that the claim of the landowners in the present appeal is squarely covered by judgment of this Court in RFA No. 2718 of 2011 Dilbagh Singh and others vs State of Haryana decided on 3.9.2015, whereby the award of the learned court below was upheld.

Since the award of the learned court below was upheld by this Court, no case for enhancement is made out. Accordingly, for the reasons mentioned in Dilbagh Singh's case (supra), the present appeal is dismissed.

7.9.2015
vs.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge