VARINDER SINGH
2015.08.27 12:56
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document
Punjab & Haryana High Court at Chandigarh

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RFA No. 524 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision : 20.8.2015

Lichmi Devi and others ... Appellants

vs

State of Haryana ... Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Kanav Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Munish Kumar Garg, Advocate, for the appellants.

Mr. Abhinash Jain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

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

Briefly, the facts of the case are that vide notification issued on 13.5.2009, published on 26.5.2009, under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, `the Act'), State of Haryana sought to acquire the land situated within the revenue estate of village Mangalpur, Tehsil Narwana, District Jind, for construction of Surbra Link Channel. Notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 22.1.2010. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, `the Collector') vide award dated 22.4.2010 assessed compensation @ ₹ 8,00,000/- per acre. Dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, the land owners filed objections. On reference under Section 18 of the Act, the learned court below vide award dated 25.7.2012 assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 10,00,000/- per acre. The learned court below has also awarded compensation of ₹ 80,000/- per acre for bifurcation. It is this award which is impugned before this court by the landowners.

VARINDER SINGH
2015.08.27 12:56
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document
Punjab & Haryana High Court at Chandigarh

Learned counsel for the landowners submitted that the claim of the appellants is squarely covered by judgment of this Court in RFA No. 501 of 2013, *Zile Singh and others vs State of Haryana and another*, decided on 14.11.2013, vide which the compensation for the land acquired vide same notification was further enhanced to ₹ 11,35,200/- per acre.

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

For the reasons recorded in *Zile Singh*'s case (supra), the present appeal is disposed of in the same terms.

20.8.2015 **(Rajesh Bindal)**
vs. **Judge**