

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 11923 of 2016

Date of Decision: 3.6.2016

Satvinder Singh and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

UT, Chandigarh and others

...Respondents.

1. Whether the Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL.
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAJ RAHUL GARG.**

PRESENT: Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate for the petitioners.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. By way of instant petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have prayed for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the notifications dated 9.8.1990 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short “the Act”) and dated 8.8.1991 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act, having lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as “2013 Act”).

2. The predecessors-in-interest of the petitioners were the owners of the land as per jamabandi for the year 1989-90 (Annexure P-

1). Respondent No.2 issued a notification dated 9.8.1990 (Annexure P-

2) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 8.8.1991 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land including the land of the petitioners for the development of residential-cum-commercial complex in Scheme No.3 of the Notified Area Committee, Manimajra, UT, Chandigarh. The award was passed on 26.2.1993 (Annexure P-4). The petitioners are still in physical possession of the land in dispute and are ready to return back the amount of compensation received by them. According to the petitioners, the acquisition proceedings have lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are in physical possession of the land in dispute. They have received the amount of compensation and are ready to return back the same. It was claimed that in such circumstances, in view of Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act, the notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the Act had lapsed. It was further submitted that since no demand notice claiming the relief as claimed in respect of lapse of notifications has been filed with the respondents, liberty be granted to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation before the appropriate authority by incorporating the grievance as raised in the present writ petition, however, direction be issued to the authority concerned to decide the representation expeditiously in a time bound manner in accordance with law.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, perusing the present petition and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, we dispose of the present petition by granting liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation raising all

the pleas as raised in the present writ petition before the appropriate authority. It is directed that in the event of a representation being filed by the petitioners within a period of two months from today, the same shall be decided in accordance with law by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to them within a period of four months from the date of receipt of representation. The petitioners shall be entitled to lead any evidence to substantiate their claim before the concerned authority. Till the matter is decided by the said authority, status quo shall be maintained by the parties. It is, however, made clear that in case no such representation is filed within the stipulated period as noticed above, the interim order shall cease to operate, thereafter.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

June 3, 2016
gbs

(RAJ RAHUL GARG)
JUDGE