

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 7654 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.3.2017

Rama Rani

.. Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present: Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

...

Rajesh Bindal J.

The petitioner has filed the present petition seeking to challenge the acquisition of land, while placing reliance on the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short, 'the 2013 Act'). The plea raised is that in view of the provisions of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, the acquisition has lapsed.

Briefly, the facts of the case are that vide notification dated 4.3.1983, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, 'the 1894 Act'), State of Haryana sought to acquire the land in villages Patti Mehar and Saundha, Tehsil & District Ambala for residential and commercial area for Sector 8, Ambala. The same was followed by notification dated 27.2.1986, issued under Section 6 of the 1894 Act. The Land Acquisition Collector, vide award dated 23.2.1988, assessed the market value of the acquired land.

It is the admitted fact on record that the petitioner had purchased the land much after the acquisition. The sale deed in favour of the petitioner is dated 18.12.1985.

The issue as to locus of a person who purchases land after acquisition thereof, has been gone into by this court in CWP No. 2304 of 2014—M/s National Packing Industries v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 8.8.2014; CWP No. 20840 of 2014—Rajiv Kumar v. State of Haryana and others, decided on 18.8.2015 and Ramesh Devi v. State of Haryana and others, 2016(1) RCR (Civil) 38 and the same was answered in negative. Special Leave Petition CC No. (c) 12535 of 2015—Suresh Garg and another v. State of Haryana and others, against the judgment of M/s National Packing Industries' case (supra) has also been dismissed. Still learned counsel for the petitioner sought to re-argue the matter stating that the same is required to be considered from a different angle, however, we do not find any reason to re-examine the issue, once it had already been considered in three different cases earlier.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the aforesaid judgments, we do not find any merit in the present petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

(Harinder Singh Sidhu)
Judge

30.3.2017

mk

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

