

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR 2780-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.01.2018

Karam Devi through her LRs Raghbir Sinngh and others

.....Petitioners

versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldeep Singh

Present: Mr.Rajan Bhargava, Advocate for
Mr.Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioners
Mr.Sumit Jain, Advocate for
Mr.Pankaj Jain, Advocate for the respondents

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldeep Singh, J. (Oral)

Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 31.8.2015 (Annexure P3), passed by learned Additional District Judge, Pathankot, vide which, while disbursing the compensation to the legal heirs of Babu Ram to the extent of 1/8th share in the land acquisition matter, the Court has asked them to furnish indemnity bonds equal to the amount to be disbursed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that when the amount of compensation has been finally decided by the Courts, they cannot be compelled to furnish the indemnity bonds, unless there is some dispute over their claim.

Considering that this is amount of compensation of land acquisition and the Court has already decided that the present petitioners are legal heirs of Babu Ram to the extent of 1/8th share, the impugned order

asking them to file indemnity bond equal to the amount being disbursed, so as to protect the interest of the State is unjustified. Accordingly, the revision petition is allowed. The petitioners are directed to file written undertaking on a plain paper that they will refund the amount, if at any stage, it is so directed by the Court.

18.01.2018

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes

Whether Reportable: No