

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

234

RFA No.131 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 24.04.2017.

Sispal (deceased th.LRs.)

.....Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

and other connected matters:

Filed By	Numbers	Total
Claimants/ landowners	RFA Nos.3821 to 3824, 3832 to 3835, 3973 to 3976, 4153 to 4156, 4219 to 4234 and 4660 of 2016	33

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present : Mr.Govind Rana, Advocate for
Mr.Harkesh Manuja, Advocate
Mr.B.K.Bagri, Advocate
Mr.Deepender Ahlawat, Advocate
Ms.Manjeet Kaur Singhal, Advocate for
Mr.S.P.Chahar, Advocate
Mr.Arun Yadav, Advocate
for the appellant(s).

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

CM No.4326-CI-2017

This is an application seeking transposition of respondent No.8
as appellant No.2, in the appeal.

Notice.

Mr.Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana, present in Court,
accept notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 and Mr. Yogesh
Chaudhary, Advocate for respondent No.3. For, respondent Nos.4 to 8 are

alleged to be proforma respondents, their service is dispensed with.

The prayer made in the application is not opposed.

For the reasons set out in the application, that is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, respondent No.8 is transposed as appellant No.2.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.331-CI of 2017

Application is allowed as prayed for.

CM No.330-CI of 2017

This is an application for condonation of delay of 1653 days in filing the accompanying appeal. All what has been urged by the learned counsel for the applicants is that the matter in issue is squarely covered by the judgment, dated 4.2.2016, rendered by this court in RFA No.266 of 2012 (Joginder Singh Tokash Vs. State of Haryana and others), and other connected matters, vide which, the compensation awarded to the claimants/landowners was enhanced by this Court.

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

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

In the wake of the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Imrat Lal and others v. Land Acquisition Collector and others, 2015(2) RCR (Civil) 437 and Dhiraj Singh (D) Tr. LRs. v. Haryana State and others, 2015 (2) RCR (Civil) 507, delay of 1653 days in filing the accompanying appeal is condoned. However, to balance the equities, for the period of delay in

filing the appeal the applicants shall not be entitled to any interest on the enhanced compensation.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.332-CI of 2017

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 Sispal-appellant No.1, who is stated to have died on 04.11.2012, as depicted in para No.3 of the application, are brought on record, for the purpose of pursuing the appeal only.

CM stands disposed of.

RFA No.131 of 2017

Vide this order and judgment I shall dispose of a batch of 34 appeals that have been preferred by the claimants/landowners. For, all these appeals arise out of the same acquisition and the question that requires consideration is the same, these are being disposed of by common order. However, by consensus the facts are being culled out from RFA No.131 of 2017 (Sispal (deceased) th.LRs. Vs. State of Haryana and others).

Vide notification dated 16.01.2007, issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act'), the land situated in four different villages Jharli, Khanpur Khurd, Goriya and Mohanbari Tehsil and District Jhajjar was sought to be acquired to set up Thermal Power Project by Aravali Power Company Private Limited. The final declaration under Section 6 was published on 12.04.2007. The Land Acquisition Collector, vide four separate awards, for each of the revenue estate i.e. Award No.46

dated 12.7.2007 (for village Khanpur Khurd), Award No.45 dated 4.6.2007 (for village Goriya), Award No.37 dated 8.5.2007 (for village Jharli) and Award No.36 dated 7.5.2007 (for village Mohanbari), had assessed the market value of the acquired land at ₹16,00,000/- per acre. Being aggrieved by the assessment as also the compensation awarded by the Collector, the claimants filed objection under Section 18 of the Act. Resultantly, the dispute was referred to the Civil Court. On a consideration of the matter in issue, the reference Court vide an identical awards, though, rendered on separate dates declined the claim of the landowners and affirmed the assessment made by the Collector. That is how, as indicated earlier, the claimants are before this Court.

Learned counsel for the parties submit, at the outset, that the matter in issue is squarely covered by the order and judgment dated 4.2.2016, rendered by this Court in RFA No.266 of 2012 (Joginder Singh Tokash Vs. State of Haryana and others) and other connected matters, vide which this Court had enhanced the compensation awarded to the claimants/landowners to ₹29,00,400/- per acre. However, against the decision of this Court, both the parties have preferred appeals before the Supreme Court. It is submitted that in the appeal (SLP (C) No(s).18034 of 2016 titled Arawali Power Company Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Joginder Singh Tokash and others) preferred by the respondent, vide order dated 26.08.2016, the Supreme Court had stayed payment of 75% of the enhanced amount to the claimants. However, the respondents were granted four weeks time to deposit the balance 25% of the enhanced compensation with the executing Court, which the claimants were permitted to withdraw on furnishing

security. Concededly, the Supreme Court is in seisin of the dispute to date. However, during the course of hearing, learned counsel for the parties have reached a consensus; that let these appeals be disposed of in terms of the decision of this Court in the case of Joginder Singh Tokash (*supra*), and the claimants shall not seek execution of the proposed order, but shall only be entitled to withdraw an amount equal to 25% of the enhancement awarded by this Court, till the matter is finally decided by the Supreme Court. Further, both the parties undertake and agree to abide by the decision of the Supreme Court, whether the compensation awarded by this Court is reduced or is further enhanced.

In the wake of the above, the present set of appeals are disposed of in terms of the decision of this Court in the case of Joginder Singh Tokash (*supra*). The respondents shall deposit an amount equal to 25% of the enhancement granted by this Court, with the executing Court, within four weeks from today. And the claimants/landowners shall be entitled to withdraw the said amount on furnishing security to the satisfaction of the executing Court. However, the balance 75% of the enhanced amount shall not be released to the claimants till the decision of the Supreme Court. For, learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that they shall abide by the decision of the Supreme Court, in both the possibilities; (a) the compensation assessed by this Court is reduced (b) there is a further enhancement in the compensation awarded to the claimants, an undertaking, in the above terms, shall be furnished by the parties before the executing Court within four weeks from today. Copy thereof, shall also be placed on record of this Court. In the event any

difficulty is faced either in construction or implementation/enforcement of this order, both the parties shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application in these appeals, itself.

The appeals are disposed of in the above terms.

24.04.2017

neenu

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No