

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

102

**RFA No.4909 of 2016(O & M)
Date of Decision:10.01.2017**

Ishwar Singh (deceased) th.LRs. and anotherappellants

Versus

State of Haryana and othersrespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr.S.S.Kaliramana, Advocate
for the appellants

ARUN PALLI, J. (ORAL):

CM No.13722-CI of 2016

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 1552 days in re-filing the accompanying appeal.

For the reasons set out in the application, that is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, delay of 1552 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.13723-CI of 2016

For the reasons set out in the application, that is duly supported by an affidavit, same is allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Consequently, legal representatives of deceased Ishwar Singh-appellant No.1, who is stated to have died on 30.03.2007, as depicted in para No.2 of the application, are brought on record, for the purpose of pursuing the appeal only.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.13724-CI of 2016 and RFA No.4909 of 2016

Learned counsel for the appellant fairly submits that the matter in

issue is squarely covered by the judgement dated 23.09.2014 rendered by this Court in RFA No.2174 of 2012 titled “Smt.Savitri Devi versus The Land Acquisition Collector, Gurgaon and others”, and the subsequent order dated 21.09.2015, passed by this Court, vide which the error in the main judgment, reflecting the compensation awarded to the landowners as ₹ 57,08,000/- was rectified to be read as ₹ 57,80,000/-, this appeal is also required to be disposed of in the same terms.

Notice.

On the asking of the Court, Mr.Shivendra Swaroop, AAG Haryana, present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents No.1 and 2 and Mr.Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.3 and 4.

The factual position as set set out above is not disputed by learned counsel for the respondents.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

For, concededly, the matter in issue is squarely covered by the judgment in the case of Savitri Devi(supra), this appeal too, is disposed of in terms thereof.

January 10, 2017
neenu

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No.

Whether reportable-

Yes/No