

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

CR No. 6073 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.04.2016

The Amritsar Improvement Trust

... Petitioner

versus

Goverdhan Dass through his Lrs and others

.... Respondents

2. CR No. 6074 of 2015 (O&M)

The Amritsar Improvement Trust

... Petitioner

versus

Goverdhan Dass through his Lrs and others

.... Respondents

3. CR No. 6075 of 2015 (O&M)

The Amritsar Improvement Trust

... Petitioner

versus

Gopal Dass through his Lrs

.... Respondents

4. CR No. 6076 of 2015 (O&M)

The Amritsar Improvement Trust

... Petitioner

versus

Shiv Kumar through his Lrs and others

.... Respondents

5. CR No. 6077 of 2015 (O&M)

The Amritsar Improvement Trust

... Petitioner

versus

Hira Lal through his LRs

.... Respondents

6. CR No. 6078 of 2015 (O&M)

The Amritsar Improvement Trust

... Petitioner

versus

Hira Lal through his LRs

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Karanjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arnav Sood, Advocate for the respondents.

K.Kannan, J. (ORAL)

The revision petitions are wholly without merit. The dispute is with reference to a claim on interest for an additional amount assessed by the Civil Court on a reference for enhancement of the amount determined by the Collector. The property acquired was land and building and the reference Court has allowed for enhancement of the value of the building. Section 28 employs a language of any sum which in the opinion of the Court, the Collector ought to have awarded as compensation is in excess and the interest shall be payable on such excess amount in the manner set out under Section 28. The counsel for the petitioner wants to make the contention that the market value of the land was not modified and only the value of the superstructure was modified and hence Section 28 will not apply. The contention is untenable and out of sync with the language employed in Section 28.

Counsel for the petitioner also has an argument that the amount calculated is incorrect. He is unable to point out to me as to what is the incorrectness about the calculation made. The argument in this regards is also rejected.

All the civil revision petitions are dismissed with the above observation.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

08.04.2016

kv