

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

CWP-3125-2020

Decided on : 05.02.2020

Raj Kumar & others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr.Sansar Kundu, Advocate
 for Mr.V.K.Jakhar, Advocate, for the petitioners.

G.S. Sandhawalialia , J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present writ petition, filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to grant the same amount of compensation as paid to the other landowners in view of the judgment passed in **RFA-266-2012** titled Joginder Singh Tokash Vs. State of Haryana & others and the judgment of the Apex Court dated 05.09.2017(Annexure P-3). Challenge has also been made to the order whereby such a relief has been denied under Section 28-A by the Land Acquisition Collector on 06.12.2018(Annexure P-5).

The said issue has already been decided by this Court in **CWP-1199-2019** titled **Mahabir & another Vs. State of Haryana & others**, on 24.01.2019.

Counsel for the petitioner has mainly tried to convince this Court that the judgment of the Apex Court in **Ramsingbhai (Ramsangbhai)**

Jerambhai Vs. State of Gujarat & another 2018 (3) RCR (Civil) 114, would not be applicable, which argument, this Court is not in agreement with. The specific issue was that enhancement by this Court and the Supreme Court, would not entitle the landowners to file a petition under Section 28-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and the principle of law was clearly culled out by the Three Judges Bench of the Apex Court. In such circumstances, the reasoning given in the impugned order dated 06.12.2018 (Annexure P-6), passed by the Land Acquisition Collector, Jhajjar, dismissing the petition filed under Section 28-A on that account, is justified.

The argument raised that the judgment only dealt with the issue of limitation, is also not correct. The relevant portion of the judgment in **Ramsingbhai** (supra) read as under:

“It is clear from the opening words of the provision that the redetermination under Section 28A is available only in respect of an “Award” passed by the “court” under Part III of the Act, comprising Sections 18 to 28A (both inclusive). The “court” referred to in Section 28A of the Act is the court as defined under Section 3(d) to mean “... a principal civil court of original jurisdiction ...”. Thus, the judgment of the appellate court is not within the purview of Section 28A. It is also to be noted that the appellate courts under Section 54 are under Part VIII of the Act whereas the redetermination is only in respect of the Award passed by the Reference Court under Part III of the Act. (See [Jose Antonio Cruz Dos R. Rodriguese & another v. Land Acquisition Collector & another](#). In its recent judgment in [Bharatsing and others v. The State of Maharashtra](#) and others, this Court has surveyed the decisions on this issue and reiterated the legal principle.

4. What the appellant seeks is redetermination of compensation under the Act in terms of the judgment of the High Court passed under [Section 54](#) of the Act. In view of the settled legal position which we have explained above, the appellant is not entitled to such a relief; his entitlement, if any, is only in terms of [Section 28A](#) of the Act based on the award of the Reference Court.

5. The appeal is accordingly dismissed. Pending application (s), if any, shall stand disposed of. No costs.”

From a reading of the above, it would be clear that the argument which has been raised by counsel is in complete contrast with what has been

laid down by the Apex Court.

Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed. However, it is made clear that it is always open to the petitioner to seek enhancement of compensation before the Executing Court, in view of the law laid down in **A.Viswanatha Pillai Vs. Special Tahsildar for Land Acquisition 1991 (4) SCC 17, Smt. Parawati and another Vs. State of Haryana 2009 (5) RCR (Civil) 572 and Parkasho Vs. State of Punjab 2011 (5) RCR (Civil) 493.**

(G.S.Sandhawalia)
Judge

05.02.2020
sunita

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