

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

C.W.P. No.16363 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 03, 2018

Uma Devi Pandey

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

Present: Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

AMIT RAWAL, J.

The short point involved in the present writ petition is whether the petitioner, who, under the garb of an association remained unsuccessful in assailing the notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 dated 04.07.2011 and 02.07.2012, Annexures P-14 and P-16 respectively, can be permitted to assail the acquisition proceedings again or not.

Conceded position on record is that the notifications aforementioned were assailed by the petitioner in the form of an association vide CWP No.14349 of 2013 and this Court vide order dated 09.07.2013 (Annexure R-1), disposed of the same petition with directions to the respondents therein to decide the claim of the petitioner in accordance with law, which was rejected by speaking order dated 09.12.2013, which has also

been upheld vide decision dated 04.09.2015 in CWP No.3060 of 2014 titled as `Resident Welfare Association Versus State of Haryana & others'. The aforementioned fact narrated in the written statement has not been controverted by the petitioner. We are, thus, of the view that the petitioner cannot be permitted to assail the aforementioned notifications under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by pointing out any circumstances enabling this Court to interfere or for bringing the case within the realm of judicial review. No ground for interference is made out.

Writ petition stands dismissed.

(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

October 03, 2018
ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No