

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

1. FAO No.4047 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 10.08.2016

Manjit Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

2. FAO No.4186 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 10.08.2016

Amarjit Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. R.S. Madan, Advocate for the respondents.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

This order of mine shall dispose of both the appeals

aforementioned.

The appellant-Land owners are aggrieved against the order of the Objecting Court, whereby the objection of the National Highway against the award dated 09.12.2012 has been allowed, in essence, the award aforementioned has been set aside.

Mr. Sherry K. Singla, learned counsel appearing on behalf of appellant submits that in both the cases, land situated at Village Daulatpur, Tehsil Pathankot, District Gurdaspur has been acquired for widening of the National Highway bearing No.1-A, and this Court had also dismissed the appeals of the Union of India filed against the dismissal of the objections vis-a-vis the award given by the arbitrator, whereby the amount of compensation to the tune of ₹7,00,000/- per marla has been reduced to ₹4,50,000/- per marla and the landowners have also been held entitled to the claim the benefit under Sections 23(2) and 28 of the Land Acquisition Act.

Notice of motion.

Mr. R.S. Madan, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of Union of India. He does not dispute to the decision rendered by this Court in FAO No.9678 of 2014 titled as Union of India and another Vs. Tehal Singh and others, decided on 30.03.2016.

In view of the aforementioned fact, order under challenge of the Objecting Court is set aside. Award of the Arbitrator is modified and the amount of compensation is reduced to ₹4,50,000/- per marla. Landowners shall be entitled to the benefit under Sections 23(2) and 28 of 1994 Act in view of the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in *M/s Golden Iron and Steel Forging Vs. Union of India and others, 2011(4) RCR*

(Civil) 375.

Both appeals are disposed of in terms of order dated 30.03.2006
passed in FAO No.9678 of 2014.

10.08.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No