

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Review Application No. 320 of 2017 (O&M) in
CWP No. 962 of 2017
Date of decision: 7.7.2017

Bachittar Singh and others

**.. Non-applicants/
petitioners**

v.

Union of India and others

**..Applicant/
.. Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR

Present: Mr. Raghujeet Singh Madan, Advocate for the applicant-
respondent No. 2.

Rajesh Bindal J.

Review of the order dated 31.5.2017 passed by this court has been sought seeking a direction that the amount of compensation payable to the landowners, whose land has been acquired for widening of NH-95 (new NH-5), will be deposited with the competent authority, however, the same may be disbursed to the landowners subject to their furnishing surety. It is for the reason that National Highway Authority of India has challenged the award of the authority.

The submission is that in case in arbitration, the applicant succeeds, it may be difficult to recover the amount from the landowners, who are large in number.

After hearing learned counsel for the applicant, we do not find any reason to review or modify the order already passed. It is a case in which the land pertaining to number of villages has been acquired. For the land of neighbouring villages, the compensation has already been deposited with the authority and paid to the landowners. In those cases, even the award passed by the authority has been accepted by the applicant, whereas for the same amount of compensation awarded for the neighbouring villages, the award is sought to be challenged. Once the applicant had accepted the award pertaining to acquisition of land of neighbouring villages, even if the award for the villages in question is being challenged, we do not find any reason to direct furnishing of surety by the landowners, whose land has been acquired.

We also do not find any reason to direct the Arbitrator to dispose of the matters pending with him in a time-bound manner as that issue was not subject-matter of the writ petition.

Accordingly, the review application is dismissed.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

(Sneh Prashar)
Judge

7.7.2017
mk

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