

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218+228

CR-6603-2018

Date of Decision:05.03.2019

Mahender Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CR-6674-2018

Prakash and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CR-6675-2018

Mahavir and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Sanjay Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral):-

Notice of motion.

Mr. Rohit Arya, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the

State.

This order shall dispose of three Revision Petitions i.e. **CR-6603-2018** titled as **Mahender Singh vs. State of Haryana and others**, **CR-6674-2018** titled as **Parkash and others vs. State of Haryana and others** and **CR-6675-2018** titled as **Mahavir and another vs. State of Haryana and others**, arising out of the same impugned order of a different co-sharers who were not diligent in filing the Reference Petition against the common award dated 30.04.2012, preferred by few of the co-sharers under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act was allowed and compensation was assessed as ₹20 lakhs per acre. Petitioner filed execution application and that was allowed and the petitioner was given the benefit.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the other co-sharers did not prefer RFA-4518-2012 in this Court whereby, the amount of compensation assessed by the Reference Court was enhanced to ₹70,40,000/- per acre and 50% severance charges.

In such circumstances, prayer has been made for granting the liberty to the petitioner to seek the modification of the order dated 11.12.2014 (Annexure P-4) whereby the petitioners were granted the same benefit as granted to other co-sharers by the Reference Court.

Learned State counsel submitted that it is not discernible whether the order passed in RFA-4518-2012 is final, or challenged by way of SLP in the Supreme Court, therefore, the petitioner cannot be permitted to seek the modification.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully gone

through the paper book.

The prayer made in the present Revision Petition for modification of the order dated 11.12.2014 (Annexure P-4) cannot be permitted. If at all the petitioners have grievance can claim the compensation *at par* with the other co-sharers have independent remedy to file the execution application, subject to the condition that the order of the Court dated 11.12.2014 (Annexure P-4) has attained finality.

In the aforementioned terms, the Revision Petitions are disposed of.

05.03.2019
anju rani

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No