

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

**CM No.9649-CI of 2016 in/and
RFA No.3517 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 14.09.2016.**

Om Parkash and others

.....Appellants

Versus

Haryana State and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present : Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate for the appellants.

Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG, Haryana.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

CM No.9649-CI of 2016

Despite opportunity, no reply has been filed to the application.

All what has been urged by the learned counsel for the applicants is that the matter in issue is squarely covered by the judgment, dated 12.08.2015, rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.6256 of 2015 (Samunder and others Vs. Haryana State and others), vide which, in the appeals arising out of the same acquisition, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had enhanced the compensation, to ₹1,00,000/- per acre.

The factual position, as set out above, is not disputed by the learned State counsel.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

In the wake of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Imrat Lal and others v. Land Acquisition Collector and others, 2015(2) RCR (Civil) 437 and Dhiraj Singh (D) Tr. LRs. v. Haryana State and others, 2015 (2) RCR (Civil) 507, delay of 1887 days in filing the accompanying appeal

is condoned. However, for the period of delay the applicants shall not be entitled to interest on the enhanced compensation.

CM stands disposed of.

RFA No.3517 of 2016

For, the learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the matter in issue is squarely covered by the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Samunder's case (supra), the present appeal is disposed of in terms of the said decision. However, the appellants shall not be entitled to interest for the period of delay in filing the appeal i.e. 1887 days.

14.09.2016

Manoj Bhutani

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No