

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 8044 of 2016

Date of Decision: 29.4.2016

Sampat Ram and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

The 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. Sanjay Mittal, Advocate for the petitioners.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J.

1. In this 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 the acquisition proceedings issued vide notifications dated 17.9.2004 (Annexure P-2) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short "the Act"), dated 27.10.2004 (Annexure P-3) under Section 6 of the Act and the award dated 9.3.2006 (Annexure P-4) have lapsed.

2. The petitioners are co-owners in possession in equal share

in the land measuring 10 kanal 4 marlas situated in village Naharpur, Tehsil Manesar, District Gurgaon as per jamabandi for the year 2003-04 (Annexure P-1). Government of Haryana issued a notification dated 17.9.2004 (Annexure P-2) under Section 4 read with Section 17(2) of the Act followed by notification dated 27.10.2004 (Annexure P-4) under Section 6 of the Act for acquisition of land of various villages including the land of the petitioners for public purpose, namely, for setting up of Chaudhary Devi Lal Industrial Model Township, Phase-V, Manesar, to be planned and developed as an integrated complex for industrial institution, commercial, recreational and other public utilities. The petitioners filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act. The award was passed on 9.3.2006 (Annexure P-4). The petitioners are still in physical possession of the land in question. However, the amount of compensation has been received by them but they are still ready to deposit the amount along with interest. 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. The amount of compensation has been received by them and they are ready to deposit the amount along with interest. 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 petitioners, 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

April 29, 2016
gbs

(RAJ RAHUL GARG)
JUDGE