

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 52 of 2016

Date of Decision: 24.5.2016

Jeet Ram and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana 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. Pulkit Dagar, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mago, AAG, Haryana.

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 mandamus directing the respondents to release their land 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”) as neither the possession of the land has been taken nor compensation has been paid to them. Further, a writ of certiorari has been sought quashing the notifications dated 31.7.2006 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short “the Act”) and dated 9.8.2007 (Annexure

P-3) under Section 6 of the Act as also the award dated 22.7.2008 (Annexure P-4).

2. The petitioners are owners in possession of the land measuring 22 kanal 14 marlas situated within the revenue estate of village Chandawali, Tehsil Ballabgarh, District Faridabad. The respondents issued a notification dated 31.7.2006 (Annexure P-1) under Section 4 of the Act followed by notification dated 8.9.2007 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land including the land of the petitioners for the development of Industrial Model Township, Faridabad. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act on 30.8.2006 (Annexure P-2). The award was passed on 22.7.2008 (Annexure P-4). The father of the petitioners filed CWP No. 15429 of 2008 for release of the land and this Court vide order dated 27.1.2010 (Annexure P-5) dismissed the said writ petition. The petitioners are still in physical possession of the land in dispute as is discernible from the photographs (Annexure P-6 Colly) and the electricity bills (Annexure P-7 Colly). No compensation has been paid to 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 and compensation has not been paid to them. 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 parties, 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

May 24, 2016
gbs

(RAJ RAHUL GARG)
JUDGE