

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-1861-2006 (O&M)
Date of Decision: December 01, 2016

Beg Raj and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

The State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | To be referred to the Reporters or not? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? | Yes/No. |
| 3. | Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? | Yes/No |

.....

Present: Mr.Amit Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Ms.Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.
Mr.Rajvir Singh Sihag, Advocate
for HSIIDC.

.....

SURYA KANT, J.

Petitioners have laid challenge to the acquisition of their land situated within the revenue estate of village Narsinghpur, Tehsil and District Gurgaon, fully described in para 2 of the petition, which was acquired vide Award dated 27.01.2006.

When this writ petition came up for hearing on February 07, 2006, ad interim stay was granted in terms of CWP No.13238 of 2004, namely, possession of the petitioners was protected.

During pendency of the writ petition, Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for brevity, 'the 2013 Act') has come into force.

Petitioners contend that the said acquisition is deemed to have lapsed on both

counts, namely, possession of the land is with them and compensation amount has been neither paid nor deposited in accordance with Section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for brevity, 'the 1894 Act').

Respondents were directed to submit a fact finding report in respect of the contentions.

As per the information received by learned State counsel in a tabulated form, the petitioners have not lifted the compensation for the acquired land. The same has not been deposited with the Reference Court also as per Section 31 of the 1894 Act. It is claimed that possession of the land was given to HSIIDC on the date of passing of the Award on 27.01.2006 but it is also admitted that a small shed alongwith boundary wall has been constructed at the site. Possession claimed to have been taken by the respondent is symbolic in nature as dispossession of the petitioners was stayed by this Court.

As a result of above discussion and for the detailed reasons assigned by us in CWP No.17464 of 2007 (**Satnam Singh and another vs The State of Haryana and others**), decided on 27.10.2016, there can be no other conclusion but to hold that the impugned acquisition qua petitioners' land has lapsed on both the grounds mentioned in Section 24(2) of 2013 Act.

Ordered accordingly.

Having held so, we are surely of the view that since Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act itself, in so many words, contemplates the possibility of reacquisition of the land/property in respect whereof the previous acquisition has lapsed, it is necessary to direct the petitioners to maintain status quo re: creation of third party rights; to keep the land/property free from all types of encumbrances and not to change the nature of land/property for a period of

one year so that meanwhile the respondent-State may, if such property is needed for a “public purpose”, again acquire it. Such a direction is necessitated also for the reason that in numerous cases State or its agencies have taken possession in part and development works have been executed except over that land/property in litigation. Those development works ought to be completed in public interest and the only consequence of lapsing of previous acquisition, mostly due to fault of the Government Officers/ Officials, would be that the owners of such land/property will be entitled to compensation and other benefits admissible under the 2013 Act.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

December 01, 2016
meenuss

**(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |