

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

1. CWP no. 8346 of 2009 (O&M)

Jagat Pal and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

2. CWP no. 11143 of 2008 (O&M)

Jai Narain and another

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

3. CWP no. 11165 of 2008 (O&M)

Jai Parkash and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

4. CWP no. 8243 of 2009 (O&M)

Kiran Singh and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

5. CWP no. 8360 of 2009 (O&M)

Ballu and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

CWP no. 8346 of 2009 (O&M)
and connected cases

2

...Respondent(s)

6. CWP no. 10109 of 2009 (O&M)

Miti Chand

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

7. CWP no. 10113 of 2009 (O&M)

Ranbir Singh and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

8. CWP no. 9223 of 2009 (O&M)

Prehlad and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

9. CWP no. 10477 of 2009 (O&M)

Dinesh and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

10. CWP no. 10491 of 2009 (O&M)

Vinod Kumar and another

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

11. CWP no. 10514 of 2009 (O&M)

Shiv Charan

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

12. CWP no. 11896 of 2008 (O&M)

Girdhari and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

13. CWP no. 6782 of 2009 (O&M)

Vandana Madan and another

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

14. CWP no. 5043 of 2009 (O&M)

Budhan and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

15. CWP no. 6195 of 2009 (O&M)

Satbir Singh and others

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE LALIT BATRA

Present : Mr. Adarsh Jain, Advocate for petitioners
in CWP Nos. 8346, 8243, 8360, 9223, 10109, 10113 of 2009
and 11165 & 11143 of 2008

Mr.Ashok Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioners
in CWP Nos. 10477, 10491 and 10514 of 2009

Ms. Rinky Gupta, Advocate for
Ms. Amrita Nagpal, Advocate for petitioners
in CWP No. 11896 of 2008

Mr. Mukesh Mehra, Advocate for
Mr. Vibhav Jain, Advocate

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. AG, Haryana

Mr. Hemant Saini, Advocate for respondent No.3
in CWP Nos. 10514 and 11165 of 2009

Mr.M.K.Sood, Advocate for applicant
in CM No.7084 of 2019 in CWP No. 10514 of 2009
and CM No.6331 of 2019 in CWP No. 10491 of 2009

MAHESH GROVER, J.(ORAL)

By this order we will dispose of 15 civil writ petitions bearing
CWP Nos.8346, 8243, 8360, 10109, 10113, 9223, 10477, 10491, 10514,
6195, 5043 & 6782 of 2009 and 11143, 11165 & 11896 of 2008.

The argument raised before us is that acquisition is bad.
Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was issued
to acquire the land for development of Sectors 75 and 80, in District
Faridabad. The proposal was to acquire 638.74 acres of land including the
land of the petitioners in all these petitions. This notification under Section
4 of the Act was succeeded by notification under Section 6. Arguments to
question the notification are broadly two fold; (i) that proper publication was
not made and (ii) land which has been released is substantially defeating the

Learned counsel for the State has pointed out that this very acquisition was questioned earlier on these two grounds and after recording its satisfaction, a Division Bench of this Court has declined interference. It was specifically noticed that proper publication was indeed made and the petitioners did not file the objections.

Same is a case here. The petitioners in the writ petitions have not filed objections. In so far as other question of release of land is concerned that too had been dealt with adequately by the Division Bench of this Court while answering CWP No.18900 of 2008. We notice that this petition was also prosecuted by the very same counsel who is prosecuting some of the petitions before us today. Finding no distinction in the present matters as the one where Division Bench had already expressed its opinion, we decline interference. Hence, instant petitions are hereby dismissed.

Keeping in view the decision in main cases, there is no need to pass an order on miscellaneous applications for impleadment of parties and the same are disposed of alongwith all other pending applications.

(Mahesh Grover)
Judge

16.05.2019

rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No

(Lalit Batra)
Judge