

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

**R.A.-CR No.61-CII of 2017 (O&M) in
C.R. No.1971 of 2004
Date of Decision.11.05.2017**

Tota Ram and othersPetitioners

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondent

2. R.A.-C.R.No.60-CII of 2017 (O&M in C.R. No.1972 of 2004

Anant RamPetitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

3. R.A-CR No.64-CII of 2017 (O&M) in C.R. No.1973 of 2004

Ujagar SinghPetitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

4. RA-CR No.58-CII of 2017 (O&M) in C.R. No.1974 of 2004

Ram PhalPetitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

5. RA-CR No.57-CII of 2017 (O&M) in C.R. No.1975 of 2004

Chanderwati etc.Petitioners

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

6. RA-CR No.59-CII of 2017 (O&M) in C.R. No.1976 of 2004

Yashwant SinghPetitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

7. RA-CR No.56-CII of 2017 (O&M) in C.R. No.1977 of 2004

Bhim SenPetitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

8. RA-CR No.62-CII of 2017 in C.R. No.1978 of 2004

Bahadur Singh etc.Petitioners

Vs

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Advocate
for the applicant/deceased-respondent No.3.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

-:-

AMIT RAWAL J.(ORAL)

The application has been moved seeking condonation of delay of 320 days on the ground that the applicants were not aware of the aforementioned pending proceedings. It is in this aspect of the matter, review of the order has been sought. The order of mine is most innocuous as the dispute is between the petitioners in the revision petition and the applicants-respondents, being lessees is as to whether in proceedings under Section 30 of the erstwhile Land Acquisition Act, who would be entitled to take compensation in proportionate. The lessees, who were respondents in the petition under Section 30 before the Court below were proceeded ex parte on 24.02.1999 and this Court had remanded the matter back to the Reference Court to grant three three effective opportunities and decide the petition under Section 30. The instant application has been moved on the premise that the applicants were not aware of aforementioned proceedings and many of the private respondents have died, hence delay.

the office report, service was not effected and many respondents despite having been served, did not appear and this was noticed while disposing of the revision petitions. Whatever the grievance of the applicants have, they can always place before the Reference Court leading evidence and get adjudication of the petition under Section 30 on merits. However, the order is dated 05.05.2016 and the applicants have not apprised as to what steps have been taken in the meantime.

The application is bereft of the aforementioned particulars. There is no error apparent on the fact of record, much less, no ground is made out to bring the aforementioned order under review. The review applications are dismissed both on account of delay and on merits.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 11, 2017
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No