

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.19905 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 09.12.2016

Raj Bala & Anr.

... Petitioners

VS.

UT Chandigarh & Anr.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes |
| 2. Whether reportable? | No |
| 3. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? | Yes / No |
| 4. To be referred to the Reporters or not? | Yes / No |
| 5. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? | Yes / No |

Present: Mr. PS Dhiman, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Shekhar Verma, Advocate;
Mr. Vishal Sodhi, Advocate for UT Chandigarh

Ms. Deepali Puri, Advocate for MC Chandigarh

SURYA KANT, J. (Oral)

(1) Both the petitioners own a plot measuring 3.5 marla situated within the revenue estate of village Manimajra, UT Chandigarh fully described in para 2 of the writ petition which was acquired vide award dated 26.02.1993. They are said to have constructed residential houses on the acquired land.

(2) The petitioners assert that the acquisition is deemed to have lapsed on the grounds mentioned in Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

(3) It is the plea of the petitioners that neither the compensation amount was paid to them nor it has been deposited with the Reference Court under Section 31(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. As per the chart

furnished by the respondents in a tabulated form, it is candidly admitted that the undisbursed compensation has been deposited in the District Court on 09.07.2014 only. In other words, the compensation amount was not deposited with the Reference Court as per Section 31(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. Thus the petitioners have fully satisfied one of the ingredients of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act.

(4) For the reasons afore-stated read with the detailed reasons assigned by this Court vide order dated 27.10.2016 rendered in **CWP No.17464 of 2007** titled as **Satnam Singh & Anr. vs. State of Haryana & Ors.**, the instant writ petition is allowed and the impugned acquisition is declared to have lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of 2013 Act.

(5) Having held so, we are further of the view that since Section 24(2) of 2013 Act itself in so many words contemplates the possibility of re-acquisition 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.

(6) Ordered accordingly.

(Surya Kant)
Judge

09.12.2016
vishal shonkar

(Sudip Ahluwalia)
Judge