

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

CWP No. 19132 of 2007 (O&M)

Date of decision : 9.11.2017

Samaj Punar Rachna Kendra

.. Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Gurvinder Singh Gill**

Present: Mr. Abhilaksh Grover, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana with
Mr. Manoj Dhankhar, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate, for HSIIDC/respondent No.3.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

The petitioner has approached this Court praying for quashing of acquisition of land, where notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act'), were issued on 11.7.2006 and 16.7.2007, respectively. Award was announced by the Land Acquisition Collector (for short 'the Collector') on 23.6.2009.

It is claimed by the petitioner that the petitioner is registered society. The land is being utilized as old age yoga kendra and day activities for senior citizens. It was claimed that the petitioner-society is still involved in day activities for senior citizens. The petitioner had filed objections under Section 5-A of the Act. Plea of discrimination was also raised claiming that land owned by other similarly situated persons was released.

Definite stand of learned counsel for the respondents is that the objections were filed by the petitioners under Section 5-A of the Act on 5.4.2007, which were not within time. As per the information received from

the field staff, no such activities are going on there. It was further submitted that the land of the petitioner is forming part of service road and green belt.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the submission noticed above, the present petition deserves to be dismissed on the ground that firstly the objections filed under Sections 5-A of the Act were not within time and as per the information received from the field staff deputed there, no such activities are being carried on the petitioner-society, as claimed. Further the land of the petitioner is required for construction of service road and green belt.

Considering the aforesaid facts, there is no merit in the present petition. Accordingly the present petition is dismissed.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

9.11.2017
sharmila

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No