

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

RFA No. 6555 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision :24.12.2015

Budh Ram

... Appellant

vs

State of Haryana and another

.. Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal

Present: Mr. Rohit Rana, Advocate for
Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Arun Beniwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

The landowner is in appeal seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land. Along with the appeal, application seeking condonation of delay of 176 days in filing thereof, has also been filed.

Briefly, the facts of the case are that State of Haryana vide notification dated 20.4.1987, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act') sought to acquire land situated in village Badkhal, Tehsil Ballabgarh, District Faridabad for development and utilization thereof as institutional Sector 48, Faridabad. The same was followed by notification dated 19.2.1988 issued under Section 6 of the Act. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, 'the Collector'), vide award No.1 dated 6.4.1989, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 3,50,000/- per acre. Aggrieved against the award of the Collector, the landowner 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 @ ₹ 200/- per square yard. The same has been impugned by the landowner before this Court in the present

Learned counsel for the landowner fairly submitted that the claim made in the present appeal is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in RFA No. 1015 of 1992- Chet Ram and others v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 16.3.2010, whereby compensation for the acquired land was assessed @ 200/- per square yard. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No.21449-51 of 2010—Chet Ram and others v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 9.8.2010, upheld the aforesaid award passed by this Court.

Accordingly, for the reasons recorded in Chet Ram's case (supra), no case for enhancement of compensation is made out. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed. Consequently, the application seeking condonation of delay is also dismissed.

24.12.2015

sharmila

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge