

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

CWP No.27511 of 2017
Date of decision: 04.12.2017

Bhagwana

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Akshat Mittal, Advocate for
Mr. Sachin Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion.

Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG, Haryana and Mr. Pritam Saini, Advocate, present in Court, accept notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and respondent No.4, respectively. Copies furnished.

For the nature of order I propose to pass in the matter, no formal written statement(s)/counter affidavit(s) is indeed necessary on behalf of the respondents, at this stage. Thus, with the consent of the parties, the petition is being disposed of finally.

Concededly, vide award No.19, dated 10.05.2006, the Land Acquisition Collector assessed the value of the acquired land. It is not disputed either that the petitioner never filed objections under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act') to the award rendered by the Collector. However, the co-landowners in references under Section 18 of the Act were awarded enhancement by the Reference Court @

₹ 43,17,841/- per acre, vide award dated 31.07.2012. Resultantly, the petitioner moved the Collector under Section 28A of the Act for re-determination of compensation. And, vide order dated 27.02.2017 (Annexure P3), the claim of the petitioner was accepted as he too was awarded compensation in terms of the award dated 31.07.2012. The limited grievance that the petitioner has is; that although a considerable time has elapsed, but the compensation in terms of the order dated 27.02.2017 is yet to be disbursed. So much so, the representation moved by the petitioner, appended as Annexure P4 with the petition, has failed to evoke any response.

Learned counsel for the respondents submit that the claim of the petitioner as also his representation (Annexure P4) shall be considered and decided within a period of eight weeks from today and the appropriate order shall be passed.

The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

Needless to assert that respondent authority shall pass a comprehensive order in accordance with law. And, if indeed, there is nothing to deny the compensation the petitioner has been found entitled to vide order dated 27.02.2017, the same shall be disbursed without any further delay.

04.12.2017
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES
NO