

CWP No.14516 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.14516 of 2018

Date of Decision: 17.08.2021

Kashmiri Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present: Mr. Shoaib Khan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J.

By filing the present writ petition, petitioner has challenged notification dated 26.06.1989 (Annexure P-3) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as '1894 Act'), notification dated 25.06.1990 (Annexure P-4) issued under Section 6 of the 1894 Act and the award dated 17.06.1992 (Annexure P-5) with a prayer for release of his land as per Section 24 (2) of the Right of Fair Compensation and Transparency in the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as '2013 Act').

2. Counsel for the petitioner asserts that in the light of the provisions as contained in Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act, respondents having neither taken physical possession of the land nor have the compensation amount been disbursed, would render the land of the petitioner acquired vide award dated 17.06.1992 liable to be released, in view of Section 24 (2) of

2013 Act. It is asserted that the land acquisition proceedings under 1894 Act would lapse. Counsel for the petitioner, on this basis, asserts that the notifications dated 26.06.1989 and 25.06.1990 as also award dated 17.06.1992 cannot sustain and deserve to be quashed.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents submits that for applicability of Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act, which would entitle the petitioner the benefit of release of land on the lapsing of the acquisition proceedings initiated under the 1894 Act, there should neither be physical possession taken nor compensation paid. If any of the two contingencies has been complied with, then the land acquisition proceedings under 1894 Act would not lapse. In this regard, counsel for the respondents has placed reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Indore Development Authority Vs. Manoharlal and others** 2020 (AIR) SC 1496.

To substantiate this contention, counsel for the respondents has referred to the reply which has been filed by way of an affidavit of Land Acquisition Collector, Urban Estate, Panchkula, dated 29.01.2021, wherein it has been stated that the possession of the land was taken vide Rapat No.449, dated 17.06.1992, after the passing of the award dated 17.06.1992.

It has further been asserted that out of the total amount of the award of Rs.7,15,03,133/-, an amount of Rs.6,89,29,020/- has already been disbursed. Rest of the amount i.e. Rs.25,14,113/- is lying deposited in the account of the Land Acquisition Collector. So far as the amount of compensation due to the petitioner is concerned, i.e. Rs.4316/-, the said amount is also lying deposited with the Land Acquisition Collector, which compensation amount has not been lifted by the petitioner.

4. His further contention is that the land of the petitioner affects the road widening of Panchkula to Yamuna Nagar road NH-7 as per the development plan and therefore, the land of the petitioner cannot be released. Since the compensation amount has been duly deposited with the Land Acquisition Collector and further, the possession has been taken vide Rapat No.449, dated 17.06.1992, the deemed lapsing of acquisition under Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act would not apply. The writ petition, therefore, deserves to be dismissed.

5. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and with their assistance have gone through the pleadings as well as the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Indore Development Authority's* case (supra).

6. The facts, as has been narrated above, have not been disputed. Notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act were issued on 26.06.1989 and 25.06.1990 respectively, leading to the passing of the award dated 17.06.1992. Petitioner is claiming himself to be the owner of plot measuring 8 marla comprised in Khasra No.39//29/2/2/2 situated in village Bana Madanpur, Hadbast No.231, Tehsil and District Panchkula, to the extent of 1/3rd share and is seeking lapsing of acquisition with the aid of Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act.

Paras 244 and 245 of the judgment in *Indore Development Authority's* case (supra) deal with the vesting of the land in the State on taking of possession of the acquired land, for which the award has been passed free from encumbrances. The person retaining possession thereafter is to be treated as a trespasser as he does not have any right to continue in

possession of the land, which has vested in the State. Possession of the land has been taken vide Rapat Roznamacha No.449, dated 17.06.1992, thus, fulfilling one of the conditions with regard to the possession having been taken over especially in the light of the fact that the possession through rapat roznamacha has been held to be valid mode of taking possession of the land.

7. As regards the compensation amount is concerned, it has been specifically averred in the reply that out of the total amount of the award of Rs.7,15,03,133/-, an amount of Rs.6,89,29,020/- has already been disbursed. Rest of the amount i.e. Rs.25,14,113/- is lying deposited in the account of the Land Acquisition Collector. So far as the amount of compensation due to the petitioner is concerned, i.e. Rs.4316/-, the said amount is also lying deposited with the Land Acquisition Collector, which compensation amount has not been lifted by the petitioner. Merely because the petitioner has not collected the amount of compensation, it would not entitle him to assert that the compensation has not been disbursed to them.

8. Para 203 of the judgment in *Indore Development Authority's* case (supra) deals with the word 'paid' and it has been concluded in para 206 that when the amount has been tendered, the obligation has been fulfilled by the Collector. In case a person does not collect the amount, he cannot take the benefit of the same by asserting that the amount has not been paid to him and as such, there is a lapse of proceedings.

Apart from that, it has been held in para 224 of the said judgment that word 'paid' used in Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act does not include within meaning the word 'deposited', which has been used for proviso to Section 24 (2). It has, therefore, been concluded that the

acquisition would not lapse, if the compensation amount is deposited with the Land Acquisition Collector, which is available for disbursement to the land owner(s).

That apart, since the land of the petitioner affects the road widening of Panchkula to Yamuna Nagar road NH-7 as per the development plan, the land of the petitioner, in any case, cannot be released as it would directly affect the planning.

9. In view of the above, we do not find any merit in the present writ petition and therefore, dismiss the same.

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

17.08.2021

Harish

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No