

232

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

CR-3425-2015

Date of decision : 30.04.2018

Union of India and others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Amar Singh and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Puneet Jindal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Bhanvi Sood, Advocate for
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate
for respondent No1.

Mr. Rajbir Singh, AAG, Haryana.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners are aggrieved of the impugned order dated 30.05.2014 (Annexure P-1), whereby an execution application filed by Amar Singh, co-sharer of the land acquired for the benefit of Ministry of Railways permitting him to withdraw the enhancement amount of compensation, has been allowed.

Mr. Puneet Jindal, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr. Lupil Gupta, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that the land belonging to two co-sharers, namely, Amar Singh and Ghan Shyam was acquired for the purpose of setting up the railway line.

Against the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector, one of the co-sharers

i.e. Ghan Shyam filed an application under Section 18 seeking enhancement of the compensation, which was allowed and in the Regular First Appeal bearing No.4534 of 2012, 50% of the enhancement amount of compensation was stayed. However, the other co-sharer Amar Singh/respondent No.1 instituted the execution application for disbursement of his share, which vide impugned order, has been allowed.

He has brought the attention of this Court to the notice of motion order dated 18.05.2015, whereby the Court had imposed some condition as was in Regular First Appeal, aforementioned.

It has been brought to the notice of this Court that the aforementioned Regular First Appeal has been disposed of.

Keeping in view the aforementioned facts, I am of the view that no cause of action survives in the present revision petition for assailing the impugned order as there is no stay viz-a-viz 50% of the enhanced amount of compensation qua the other co-sharer. No ground is made out for interference, accordingly, the present revision petition is dismissed.

30.04.2018

Yogesh Sharma

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

✓

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/ No**

✓

Whether Reportable **Yes/ No**