

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

RFA No.4969 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.8.2015

Narinder Kumar

..... Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL**

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Advocate and  
Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate, for the landowner(s).

Mr. Arun Beniwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

**RAJESH BINDAL, J**

This order will dispose of two appeals bearing RFA Nos. 4969 and 5448 of 2014, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein.

The landowners before this Court are seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Brief facts of the case are that the State of Haryana vide notification dated 3.2.2000 published on 15.2.2000, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act') sought to acquire land situated within the revenue estate of village Janetpur, Tehsil and District Ambala, for defence purposes. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 17.8.2000. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector') vide award No.2 dated 10.9.2001 assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 2,40,000/- per acre for chahi and ₹ 1,80,000/- per acre for other kinds of land. The landowners feeling dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, filed objections. Considering the material placed on record, the learned court below vide awards dated 30.9.2010 and 7.9.2013, determined the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 198/- per square yard. These awards have been impugned in the present appeals.

Learned counsel for the State submitted that the claim made in the present appeals is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court passed in RFA No.1590 of 2011—Roshan Lal and another v. State of Haryana and another, decided on 8.7.2015, whereby award of the court below qua village Janetpur was upheld.

Learned counsel for the landowners did not dispute the aforesaid fact.

Considering the aforesaid fact nothing survives in the present set of appeals. Accordingly, for the reasons recorded in Roshan Lal's case (supra), the present appeals are dismissed. Consequently, the accompanying application(s) for delay are also dismissed.

**(RAJESH BINDAL)**  
**JUDGE**

27.8.2015

*sharmila*