

CWP No.27798 of 2017

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

CWP No.27798 of 2017

Date of Decision: 16.09.2021

Lalit Mohan & others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. V.D. Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

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

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J.

By filing the present writ petition, petitioners have challenged notification dated 27.08.2004 (Annexure P-1) issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as '1894 Act'), notification dated 24.08.2005 (Annexure P-3) issued under Section 6 of the 1894 Act and award dated 21.03.2007 (Annexure P-9) with a prayer for release of their land as per Section 24 (2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as '2013 Act') in the light of the judgment dated 27.10.2016 (Annexure P-11) passed by this Court in a bunch of cases, lead case of which was CWP No.14867 of 2016, titled as 'Sunita Sharma Vs. State of Haryana & another'.

2. It has been pleaded in the writ petition that the petitioners had

submitted their objections under Section 5-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, dated 22.09.2004 (Annexure P-2), which were rejected and notification dated 24.08.2005 (Annexure P-3) issued under Section 6 of 1894 Act. Thereafter, petitioners approached this Court by filing CWP No.16604 of 2006, where their dispossession was initially stayed but later on, the said writ petition was dismissed vide order dated 31.10.2013 (Annexure P-8) upholding the notifications dated 27.08.2004 (Annexure P-1) and dated 24.08.2005 (Annexure P-3). Assailing the said order dated 31.10.2013 (Annexure P-8), petitioners had approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing SLP, which also stood dismissed vide order dated 15.09.2017 (Annexure P-10), however, liberty was granted to the petitioners to take their remedies in accordance with law, if they have any grievance about lapsing of proceedings which may require adjudication of a disputed question of fact. In the meantime, similarly situated landowner approached this Court for quashing the acquisition proceedings in the light of Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act, by filing CWP No.14867 of 2016, titled as 'Sunita Sharma Vs. State of Haryana & another', which has been decided with eight other similar cases vide judgment dated 27.10.2016 (Annexure P-11) granting the benefit of Section 24 (2) of 2013 to the landowners.

3.. Counsel for the petitioners asserts that in the light of the above judgment of this Court and keeping in view 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 petitioners acquired vide award dated 21.03.2007 (Annexure P-9) liable to be released. It is asserted that the land

acquisition proceedings under 1894 Act would lapse. Counsel for the petitioners, on this basis, asserts that the notifications dated 27.08.2004 (Annexure P-1) and dated 24.08.2005 (Annexure P-3) as also award dated 21.03.2007 (Annexure P-9) cannot sustain and deserve to be set aside.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents submits that for applicability of Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act, which would entitle the petitioners 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 Department, Panchkula, dated 07.09.2021, wherein it has been stated that the possession of the land in question was taken vide Rapat No.1247-48, dated 21.03.2007. It has further been asserted that the entire award amount was tendered at the time of announcement and was very much available with LAC for disbursement. Out of the total amount of the award of ₹25,24,49,039/-, an amount of ₹2,81,68,698/- has already been disbursed and rest of the amount is available for disbursement. So far as the amount of compensation due to the petitioners is concerned, i.e. ₹2,07,64,389/-, the said amount has not been received by the petitioners and they are at liberty to receive the same.

5. His further contention is that the land of the petitioners affects the site of one water works, 21 convenient shops, 2 roads of 24 meter, dispensary site, 36 shops of three storey, 15 numbers of small booking agency, 2 bus site, one release structure under Section 5-A, 2 numbers of KIOSK, one dhaba site, one parking, one service station and 7 shops of body building and therefore, the land of the petitioners 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 Nos.1247 and 1248, dated 21.03.2007, the deemed lapsing of acquisition under Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act would not apply. The writ petition, therefore, deserves to be dismissed.

6. 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).

7. The facts, as has been narrated above, are not in dispute. Notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act were issued on 27.08.2004 and 24.08.2005 respectively, leading to the passing of the award dated 21.03.2007. Petitioners are 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 taking of possession through Rapat Roznamacha entry has been held to be a valid mode of taking possession of

land. 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 No.1247-48 dated 21.03.2007, 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.

8. As regards the compensation amount is concerned, it has been specifically averred in the reply that the entire award amount was tendered at the time of announcement and was very much available with LAC for disbursement. Out of the total amount of the award of ₹25,24,49,039/-, an amount of ₹2,81,68,698/- has already been disbursed and rest of the amount is available for disbursement. So far as the amount of compensation due to the petitioners is concerned, i.e. ₹2,07,64,389/-, the said amount has not been received by the petitioners and they are at liberty to receive the same. Merely because the petitioners have not collected the amount of compensation, it would not entitle them to assert that the compensation has not been disbursed to them.

9. 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).

10. So far as the judgment passed by this Court in CWP No.14867 of 2016, titled as 'Sunita Sharma Vs. State of Haryana & another' is concerned, on which reliance has been placed by the petitioners, the said judgment is of no help to the petitioners in the light of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Indore Development Authority's* case (supra), where it has been categorically held that for applicability of Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act, which would entitle the petitioners 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. It may be added here that both these contingencies have been complied with in the present case and therefore, the land acquisition proceedings cannot be held to be lapsed under Section 24 (2) of 2013 Act.

11. That apart, since the land in question affects the site of one water works, 21 convient shops, 2 roads of 24 meter, one dispensary site, 36 shops of three storey, 15 numbers of small booking agency, 2 pus site, one release structure under Section 5-A, 2 numbers of KIOSK, one dhaba site, one parking, one service station and 7 shops of body building, the land of the petitioners, in any case, cannot be released as it would directly affect the

planning.

12. 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

16.09.2021
Harish

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