

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

RFA No.172 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 09.03.2018

Maruti Suzuki India Limited	Versus	 Appellant(s)
State of Haryana and others		Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate with
Mr. M.S. Atwal, Advocate for
Maruti Suzuki India Limited.

Mr. Shailendra Jain, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Satyendra Chauhan, Advocate,
Mr. Pawan Kumar, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Rozer Kumar Aggarwal, Advocate,
Ms. Manisha Gandhi, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Ashwani Gaur, Advocate
Mr. G.C.Shahpuri, Advocate
Mr. Ranjit Saini, Advocate,
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. P.R.Yadav, Advocate,
Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate,
Mr. Gaurav Aggarwal, Advocate for the landowners.

Mr. Sudeep Mahajan, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana,
for State as well as for Haryana State Industrial and
Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd.

Ms. Safia Gupta, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. A.K.Chopra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. G.S.Bhandol, Advocate and
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate for Haryana State
Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd.

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J.

CM-300-CI-2014

Application has been filed for condoning the delay of 848
days in filing the appeal.

Accordingly, the same is also dismissed, since the appeal

itself is not maintainable on behalf of the MSIL. The detailed reasons have also been given in the judgment of even date passed in **RFA No.2373 of 2010 'Madan Pal (III) Vs. State of Haryana and another'**.

CM stands disposed of.

CM-301-CI-2014

Application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC has been filed for impleading Maruti Suzuki India Limited on the ground that the applicant-appellant would have an interest in the litigation, in view of the enhancement of the price of the land under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. It has further been averred that the land was acquired by the State of Haryana for HSIIDC in different phases under the Land Acquisition Act for the purpose of setting up of industrial town in Manesar and HSIIDC has allotted the land to the MSIL.

The acquisition, thus, was for the purpose of industrial estate and not for MSIL and, therefore, this claim for being impleaded as interested person does not survive, keeping in view the judgment of the Apex Court in **'Satish Kumar Gupta and others Vs. State of Haryana and others'** AIR 2017 SC 1072 on the point in issue, whereby the matter has been discussed threadbare. The question posed by the Apex Court and relevant part of the said judgment reads as under:-

“2. Question for consideration is whether a post-acquisition allottee of land is necessary or proper party or has any locus to be heard in the matter of determination of compensation under the scheme of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (the Act). If not, whether the impugned order permitting additional evidence and directing remand is sustainable.

Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

15. In Himalayan Tiles (supra) the acquisition was under Part-VII of the Act. In Santosh Kumar (supra) the question was whether award of the Collector could be challenged, to which this Court answered in the negative except on the ground of fraud, corruption or collusion. In Neyveli Lignite (supra) again the acquisition was under Part-VII of the Act and in that context this Court held that the expression “person interested” could include a company or local authority for whose benefit the land was acquired. The post-acquisition allottee cannot by any stretch of imagination be treated at par with beneficiary for whom the land was acquired. In U.P. Awas Evam Vikas Parishad (supra), the matter dealt with was in the context of statutory authority for whom the land was acquired. Delhi Development Authority v. Bhola Nath Sharma (dead) by Lrs. and ors. was a case in the context of beneficiary for whom the land was acquired.

18. Accordingly, we hold that the post-acquisition allottee has no locus to be heard in the matter and is neither a necessary nor a proper party.”

Therefore, the application is not maintainable and same is, accordingly, dismissed.

CM stands disposed of.

Main appeal

The notification in the present case is '26.02.2002' instead of '26.06.2002', which has also been mentioned in paragraph No.14 of the impugned award.

The appeal is dismissed on the ground of non-maintainability and in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in '**Satish Kumar Gupta and others Vs. State of Haryana and others**' AIR 2017 SC 1072, being post-acquisition allottee. For detailed reasons, see judgment of even date

passed in **RFA No.2373 of 2010 'Madan Pal (III) Vs. State of Haryana and another'**.

March 09, 2018

pvd

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No