

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

CWP No. 3937 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.12.2017

Smt. Pushpa Devi

.. Petitioner

vs

The State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

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

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana,
Mr. Manoj Dhankhar and Shivendra Swaroop, Assistant
Advocate Generals, Haryana.

Mr. Talwinder Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Hemant Saini, Advocate, for respondent no. 8.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

The petitioner has approached this Court challenging acquisition of land for which notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the 1894 Act'), were issued on 6.2.2013 and 27.12.2013, respectively. Award was announced by the Land Acquisition Collector on 24.12.2015.

Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the petitioner had purchased the land vide sale-deed dated 9.12.2013 after notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act had been issued on 6.2.2013.

After hearing learned counsel for the State and considering the averments made, we do not find any merit in the present writ petition, as the petitioner had purchased the land on 9.12.2013 i.e. after issuance of

notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, which was issued on 6.2.2013.

She has no locus to challenge the acquisition.

Prima-facie, there is no merit in the petition. However, as none
has appeared for the petitioner, the writ petition is dismissed in default.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

12.12.2017
vs

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No