

**131 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

**CWP-12448-2017
Reserved on: 18.04.2024
Pronounced on: 29.04.2024**

MOHAN LALPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA**

Argued by: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. A.G., Haryana with
Mr. P.P.Chahar, Sr. DAG, Haryana and
Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate with
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur Manchanda, Advocate and
Mr. Shivam Garg, Advocate
for the respondent - HSVP.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J.

1. Through the instant petition, the petitioner seeks the quashing of notification bearing No. LAC(P)-NTLA-93/1188 dated 02.03.1993 (Annexure P-1), and, also seeks the quashing of notification bearing No. LAC(P)-NTLA-94/803 dated 01.03.1994 (Annexure P-3). The said notification(s) were respectively issued under Sections 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the Act of 1894'). The consequent thereto award has also been asked to be quashed, and, set aside.

2. The above espoused writ claims become founded upon the provisions of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and

2013 (for short 'the Act of 2013'), whereunders the petitioner becomes empowered to claim the making of a lapsing declaration.

3. The present petitioner would be entitled to the espoused writ relief(s), as relates to this Court, thus declaring rather lapsed the extantly drawn acquisition proceedings, but only when the provisions embodied in Section 24(2) of the 'Act of 2013', become proved to become breached by the respondents. However, for the reasons to be assigned hereinafter, the asked for relief qua the making of a lapsing declaration rather cannot be accorded by this Court.

4. Primarily for the reason, that the present petitioner would be entitled to coax this Court to declare the launching of the acquisition proceedings under the Act of 1894, to thus become lapsed, but only when the respondent-State, rather had completely failed to, in terms of the verdict rendered by the Constitutional Bench of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Indore Development Authority versus Manohar Lal and others, reported in (2020) 8 SCC 129***, adduce sufficient/clinching discharging evidence, in respect of the duo parameters, inasmuch as, (i) qua rapat possession being made over the acquired lands, (ii) and, qua the compensation, as became determined by the Collector concerned, becoming deposited for therebys its becoming available for being released to the land losers concerned, besides the said events evidently happening before the coming into force of the 'Act of 2013'.

5. To determine the above, it is necessary to refer to the reply on affidavit, already on record. A reading of the paragraph no. 8 of the said reply on affidavit, reveals, that possession over the acquired lands became assumed through rapat No. 339 dated 28.02.1996 and the

mutation No. 2332 dated 01.01.2004 has been entered in favour of the beneficiary department.

6. Moreover, when it is further indicated in the reply, on affidavit, furnished to the writ petition, by the respondent concerned, that out of the total amount of assessed compensation, under award No.7 dated 28.02.1996, an amount of Rs.17,31,30,265/- rather becomes disbursed to the land losers concerned. Furthermore, it has been stated that as far as the compensation of the land of the petitioner is concerned, despite the same becoming tendered, yet the petitioner not seeking disbursement(s) thereof, and the same is lying deposited in the LAC account, for thereby it becoming available for becoming released to the land loser concerned.

7. In consequence, since both the above events took place prior to the coming into force of the 'Act of 2013', resultantly, in terms of the verdict recorded by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Indore Development Authority's case (supra)**, the present petitioner is not entitled to make any espousal before this Court, that a lapsing declaration be made in terms of Section 24(2) of the 'Act of 2013'. In sequel, the above made writ claim is declined.

8. Furthermore, a perusal of para No. 3 of the reply on affidavit, reveals that the petitioner had earlier challenged the acquisition proceedings by way of filing CWP-25766 of 2013 and the same was disposed of vide order dated 25.11.2013 by this Court with a direction to the respondent to consider the claim of the petitioner, whereafter the representation made by the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 27.05.2014.

9. Thereafter, the petitioner again challenged the acquisition proceedings by way of filing CWP No. 12470 of 2014 and the same was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 12.09.2014 with a direction to the respondent to decide the representation of the petitioner. In compliance to the said order, the petitioner made detailed representation in terms of the provisions of Section 24 (2) of the 'Act of 2013'. However, the same became rejected through an order made on 24.02.2015 (Annexure P-11).

10. Though, the petitioner herein through the instant writ petition makes a challenge to Annexure P-11. However, when the said order (Annexure P-11), is a well informed and reasoned order and is not cryptically drawn besides for reasons (*supra*), this Court does not deem it fit and appropriate to quash Annexure P-11 or accord the espoused relief to the petitioner.

11. The further reason for declining the writ relief to the petitioner is grooved in the factum that the petitioner was not owner at the time of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the 'Act of 1894' rather he purchased the land in dispute vide registered sale deed dated 22.04.1993, thus after the issuance of notification under Section 4 of the 'Act of 1894'. Therefore, the said deed of conveyance is vitiated, as on launching of the acquisition proceedings, the vendor concerned became divested of any right, title or interest over the acquired lands, whereas, complete investment of right, title and interest over the acquired lands, rather becomes thus conferred, upon, the acquiring authority. Resultantly thereby also the present petitioner has no *locus standi* to maintain the instant petition, as he acquired no lawful title of

12. Moreover, the plea of the petitioner qua his still lawfully retaining the possession over the subject lands, is a mis-founded plea, as, the occupation of the petitioner, over the subject lands rather is as trespassers thereovers and the petitioner is required to be lawfully evicted therefroms.

13. Conspicuously also since it has been stated, in the reply on affidavit, already on record, that the subject lands are an integral component of the layout plans, thereby when they are facilitating the relevant public purposes. Consequently, when public purpose than the individualistic interest is rather to be furthered. Resultantly, this Court finds no merit in the instant petition, and, is constrained to dismiss it.

Final Order of this Court.

14. In aftermath, this Court finds no merit in the writ petition, and, with the above observations, the same is dismissed. The impugned notification(s), and consequent thereto award are maintained and affirmed.

15. No order as to costs.

16. Since the main case itself has been decided, thus, all the pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

29.04.2024
kavneet singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No