

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

**RFA No.5941 of 2011 (O&M)
Date of Decision:19.03.2018**

Rajender Singh	Versus	...Appellant(s)
State of Haryana and others		...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G. S. SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Shailendra Jain, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Satyendra Chauhan, Advocate,
Mr. Pawan Kumar, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Sudhir Aggarwal, Advocate
Mr. R.A.Yadav, Advocate
Mr. Pradeep Chokhar, Advocate, for
Mr. P.R.Yadav, Advocate,
Mr. Anil Kumar Rana, Advocate, for the landowners.

Mr. Sudeep Mahajan, Addl. A.G. Haryana.
Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate, for HSIIDC

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J. (ORAL)

The notification in the present case is '26.02.2002', however, in the impugned award, it has been wrongly mentioned as 26.06.2002 and in para No.14 of the judgment itself reference has been made to the correct date of notification as 26.02.2002.

In RFA No.4592 of 2011- **Jaibir & others Vs. State of Haryana & others**", the appeal stands allowed in terms of the order dated 09.03.2018 passed in RFA No.2373 of 2010 titled "**Madan Pal (III) Vs. State of Haryana and another**" and other connected appeals, wherein compensation has been fixed for the said villages @ Rs.41.40 lakhs per acre for notification dated 26.02.2002. Relevant part of the judgment dated 09.03.2018 in Madan Pal (III)'s case (supra) reads as under:

"140. Accordingly, the appeals filed by the HSIIDC seeking reduction in the compensation and of MSIL are dismissed and those

of the land owners alongwith cross-objections are allowed.

(i) The market value of the land falling in five village i.e. Naharpur Kasan, Kasan, Bas Huria, Bas Khusla and Dhana is assessed @ Rs.41.40 lakhs per acre alongwith all statutory benefits.

(ii) The market value of land in village Manesar is assessed @ Rs.62.10 lakhs per acre alongwith all statutory benefits.

(iii) The appellant-M/s Kohli Holdings Private Limited in RFA No.4646 of 2010 would be entitled for compensation Rs.62.10 lakhs per acre, on account of it being given benefit of 50% of locational advantage being situated on the highway and in village Manesar apart from that it would be entitled for 30% more compensation on account of severance charges on the abovesaid market value alongwith all statutory benefits.

(iv) The directions of the Apex Court in the case of Pran Sukh will also be adhered to while disbursing the balance amount of compensation.

(v) Where appeals have been filed by the land owners which were beyond period of limitation and applications have been filed for condoning the delay with a condition that the land owners will not be entitled for the interest during the said period, the Executing Court shall ensure that the amounts are calculated and disbursed, keeping in the view the said condition which has been passed in the case of each and individual land owner.

*(vi) The appeals filed by the MSIL are dismissed on account of non-maintainability and in view of the observations of the Apex Court in the case of **Satish Kumar Gupta (supra)** being a post notification allottee.”*

The present appeal is also allowed in the same terms.

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

19.03.2018
pvd

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