

207

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

(1) CWP No.3771 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.09.2016

Balwan and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

(2) CWP No.23980 of 2015 (O&M)

Seema and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HONBLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HONBLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA**

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable? | Yes/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. Mohit Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate,
for respondent No.8.

Mr. Rajeev Anand, Advocate,
for respondent No.9.

SURYA KANT J. (ORAL)

We have heard learned counsel for the parties. The challenge laid by the petitioners to the acquisition of their land by way of notifications dated 11.02.2010 and 19.02.2010 (P-7 & P-8) issued under Sections 4 and 6 read with Section 17 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, has been squarely

answered partly in their favour by this Court in **CWP No.21572 of 2011** decided on 04.09.2013 **(Rohtash and others Vs. State of Haryana and others)**.

(2) The State of Haryana challenged the above-cited decision in SLP(Civil) No.18118 of 2014, which has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 17.11.2014. The said decision thus has attained finality.

(3) The instant writ petition is, therefore, allowed in terms of the above-cited decision of *Rohtash and others case (supra)*.

(4) Ordered accordingly.

(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE

20.09.2016

Bhumika

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE