

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

**CR No. 7914 of 2014 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 16.02.2016**

Zile Singh and others

... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana through the Collector Hisar and others

.... Respondents

**2. CR No. 260 of 2015 (O&M)**

Chatar Singh (D) through LR's and others

... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN**

----

Present: Mr. Ajay Jain, Advocate, for the petitioner.

**K.Kannan, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner is aggrieved that the interest on solatium has not been provided for a period prior to the decision in Sunder Vs. Union of India, (2001) 7 SCC 211. The said decision was explained in Gurpreet Singh v. Union of India (2006) 9 SCC 457 which lays down in paragraph No.54 that in respect of claims which were not closed, the compensation is payable from the date of the award and they cannot be restricted only from the date of the judgment in Sunder Vs. Union of India, (2001) 7 SCC 211. It can be denied only in cases where interest on solatium was asked for and denied by the Court and became final upto the higher forum. If there was no express or implied refusal for interest on solatium and there has been on conclusion of judicial proceeding by record of full satisfaction, the claimant shall be entitled to interest even prior to the date of the Sunder's case (supra).

This decision has been explained in the recent judgment of this Court in Union of India Vs. Bhalle Ram and others, CR No. 690 of 2016, dated 03.02.2016.

The calculation can be appropriately made and the Court will examine the memo of calculation and proceed further in accordance with law.

The civil revision petition is allowed and the impugned order is set aside.

**(K.KANNAN)**  
**JUDGE**

16.02.2016

kv