

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.6535 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 15.12.2017

**Siri Ram and another**

**... Petitioners**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana and others**

**... Respondents**

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

Present:- Mr. M.L. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Palika Monga, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Rajesh Bindal, J.**

Challenge in the present petition is to the acquisition of land. The notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 were issued on 11.2.2010 and 19.2.2010, respectively. Award was announced by the Land Acquisition Collector (for short 'the Collector') on 14.6.2010.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that prayer made in the present petition is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in CWP No.21572 of 2011-Rohtas and others Vs. State of Haryana and others.

Though, learned counsel for the State did not dispute that the issues raised in the present petition have been gone into by this Court in Rohtas's case (supra), however, she raised the issue regarding delay in filing of the writ petition, as the award in the present case was announced by the Collector on 14.6.2010.

Her grievance is that in the aforesaid judgment direction was issued that the petitioners therein be not dispossessed from the residential houses, unless alternate plots are allotted to them and they are given reasonable time to raise construction. On a query by the Court, as to whether the claims of the land owners, when writ petitions were decided earlier by this Court, have been settled by allotting them alternate plots, her submission was that all the claims have not yet been settled.

We do not find any merit in the plea raised by learned counsel for the State, regarding delay in filing the writ petition, as even the claims regarding allotment of alternate plots to the land owners, who had earlier approached this Court and raised construction of their houses, have not been settled till date. In the case in hand, also the petitioners have placed on record photographs of the constructed houses on part of the acquired land.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the submissions noticed above, the present writ petition is disposed of in terms of the judgment of this Court in Rohtas's case (supra).

( Rajesh Bindal )  
Judge

( Gurvinder Singh Gill )  
Judge

15.12.2017  
pankaj

Whether speaking /reasoned                      Yes / No

Whether Reportable                                      Yes / No