

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

RFA No. 6306 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision :10.12.2015

Raj Kumar

... Appellant

vs

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Rajiv Sharma Advocate, for the landowner(s).

Ms. Vibha Tewari, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

This order will dispose of a bunch of appeals bearing RFA Nos. 6306 to 6311, 6344 to 6348, 6473 and 6474 of 2015, as common questions of law and facts are involved therein. However, facts have been extracted from RFA No.6306 of 2015.

The landowner(s) are in appeal seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land.

Briefly, the facts of the case are that State of Haryana vide notification dated 30.12.2002, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act') sought to acquire land situated in village Jhajjar, Hadbast No.100, Tehsil and District Jhajjar for development and utilization thereof as residential and commercial for Sector-6, Jhajjar. The same was followed by notification dated 8.12.2003 issued under Section 6 of the Act. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector'), vide his award No.5 dated 5.12.2005, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 12,50,000/- per acre. Aggrieved against the award of the Collector, the landowner(s) filed objections which were referred to the learned court below, who keeping in view the material placed on record by the parties, assessed the compensation for the acquired land @ ₹ 13,78,574/- per acre. The same has been impugned by the landowner(s)

before this Court.

Learned counsel for the landowner(s) submitted that the claim made in the present set of appeals is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in RFA No. 3267 of 2015- Ram Kanwar v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 27.11.2015, whereby the award of the learned court below with regard to the amount of compensation was upheld and the landowners were granted statutory benefit under Section 23(1A) of the Act.

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

Accordingly, for the reasons recorded in Ram Kanwar's case (supra), the present set of appeals is disposed of in the same terms.

10.12.2015

sharmila

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge