

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

**CWP No. 5083 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.04.2016**

Sushil Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

Union of India and Others

...Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Parshotam Lal Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing the notification No. S.O.130(E) dated 17.01.2014 (Annexure P-1) and notification No. S.O.2433(E) dated 18.09.2014 (Annexure P-4) and further a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to release the land of the petitioners.

2. On the last date of hearing on 28.03.2016, an affidavit of the petitioners had been filed wherein it was stated that notification for acquisition of land is not being assailed whereas the award of compensation to the petitioners is challenged as per the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (*in short* 'the 2013 Act'). The petitioners have confined the prayer in the writ petition to the quantum of compensation only.

3. After arguing for sometime, learned counsel for the

petitioners submitted that the writ petition may be disposed of by permitting the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation laying claim for compensation under the provisions of the 2013 Act. However, a prayer was made that a direction be issued to the respondents to decide the same expeditiously.

4. In view of above, the writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to file a detailed and comprehensive representation before the respondents within one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It is directed that in case any such representation is filed by the petitioners before the respondents, the same shall be decided by the concerned Authority within two months from the date of its filing by passing a speaking order and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners in accordance with law.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

21.04.2016
waseem

(RAJ RAHUL GARG)
JUDGE