

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.16824 of 2016

Date of Decision: August 22, 2016

Harvinder Singh and anotherPetitioners
versus
U.T. Chandigarh and othersRespondents

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

Present: Mr.P.C.Dhiman, Advocate, for the petitioners.

-. -

1. Whether Reporters of 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?

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

The land of the petitioners was statedly acquired vide notifications dated 28.06.1990 and 24.06.1991 issued under Sections 4 & 6, respectively of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, followed by an Award dated 21.06.1993. The petitioners have admittedly received compensation etc. They aver that since possession of the acquired land is continuously with them, hence, acquisition be taken to have been lapsed in view of Section 24 (2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

A Coordinate Bench vide order dated 03.06.2016 in a case titled as Satwinder Singh and others versus U.T. Chandigarh and others (CWP No.11923 of 2016), pertaining to same acquisition, has asked the petitioners to submit a comprehensive representation to the authorities who

shall then consider and decide the same by a reasoned order. The instant

writ petition is accordingly disposed of in the same terms.

The parties shall maintain *status-quo* re: possession till the representation is decided.

Dasti.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

August 22, 2016
mohinder

[SUDIP AHLUWALIA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No