

the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and hence the answering Respondent has duly discharged its obligation to make the compensation available for disbursement to the eligible owners/interested persons.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondents relies on the decision of this Court in ***Maya Devi v. Union of India 2017 LawSuit (Del) 6436***, where in similar circumstances it was held that the burden could not be shifted on the Land Acquisition Collector (LAC) to pursue the claimants asking them to collect the compensation by issuing notices. It was noted that in those cases, as in these cases, no attempt was made by any of the claimants to follow up with the matter or make any representation for compensation to be disbursed.

4. Having considered the above submissions, the Court is of the view that since even in the present case the compensation amount was deposited by the LAC in the reference Court way back on 12th February, 1974 and the Petitioner made no attempt to come forward with his claim till the year 2017, the Court cannot come to his assistance.

5. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

NOVEMBER 13, 2018/sapna