

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

204

**CM-14744-2016
in/
and
CWP-3611-2002
Date of Decision:10.10.2017**

Ravi Inder Singh Sidhu and others

....petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr.Binderjit Singh, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioners

Mr.Jagdeep Ghumman, DAG Punjab

Mr.R.S.Modi, Advocate
for respondent No.3

ARUN PALLI, J. (ORAL):

CM-14744-2016

Learned counsel for the parties are ad idem that although, the petition in hand, arises out of 25.21 Acres Scheme, but, the matter in issue is squarely covered by an order/judgement dated March 10, 2014, rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP No.3603 of 2012 (Nachhattar Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others), vide which, in the petitions arising out of 16.44 Acres Scheme, as also from the scheme in question i.e. 25.21 Acres, this Court had enhanced the compensation awarded to the claimant-landowners to ₹ 166/- per sq.yard.

Concededly, even the Special Leave Petition preferred against the decision of the Division Bench has since been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Not just that, post decision by the Division Bench in

Nachhattar Singh's case (supra), the petitions arising out of 25.21 Acres

Scheme have also been disposed of, in terms of the decision of the Division Bench. That being so, it is submitted that the present petition too be disposed of in the same terms.

With the consent of learned of learned counsel for the parties, the petition is taken up on Board for hearing.

CM stands disposed of.

CWP-3611-2002

For, learned counsel for the parties are ad idem that the matter in issue is squarely covered by the judgement rendered in Nachhattar Singh's case (Supra), the present petition too is disposed of in the same terms.

October 10, 2017
neenu

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable-

Yes/No
Yes/No