



## Decided on:-02.12.2025

for the appellant.  
Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate,  
for the respondents/cross-objectors.

Mr. Gunjan Mehta, Addl. A.G, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)**

1. Vide this common judgment, the aforementioned four Regular First Appeals along with cross-objections are being decided as all have arisen out of the same award.

1.2 For convenience, the facts are being taken from RFA-4373-2003 and XOBJR-36-CI-2005.

2. By way of present appeals, challenge has been laid to an Award dated 02.06.2003 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Amritsar (for short, "Reference Court"), whereby, reference petition(s) preferred at the instance of respondents(s)-landowner(s) invoking Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for brevity, "the 1894 Act"), were partly accepted.

3. In the present case, some land owned by the respondents-landowners situated in the revenue estate of Village Khakh, Tehsil Taran Tarn, District Amritsar, came to be acquired vide notifications dated 06.11.1980 and 20.01.1981, issued under Sections 4 & 6 respectively of the 1894 Act, for the public purpose, namely, setting up an Industrial Complex at Goindwal. The total land acquired was 1354 kanals 15 marlas. The Land Acquisition Collector vide its Award dated 12.06.1981, assessed the market value of the acquired land and awarded Rs.10,000/- per acre for *Chahi/nehri* land, Rs.8000/- per acre for *Barani* land and Rs.5000/- per acre for *Banjar/Gair Mumkin* land.

4. Dissatisfied with the award of the Land Acquisition Collector, the respondents(s)-landowner(s) filed separate reference petition(s) under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, seeking enhancement of compensation. Upon consideration of the material available on record, the Reference Court vide its decision dated 02.06.2003, awarded the enhanced compensation at the uniform rate of Rs.40,000/- per acre besides, grant of all other statutory benefits.

5. Feeling dissatisfied with the aforesaid Award passed by the Id. Reference Court, the PSIEC preferred their appeals and the landowners preferred their cross-objections.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, who have vehemently argued at length and gone through the paper book. I am unable to find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the appellants, especially, when the determination made by the learned Reference Court is based on a previous award dated 27.09.1986 Ex.A-X, which pertained to the same acquisition proceedings initiated vide notification dated 06.11.1980 for the same same purpose i.e. for the development of industrial complex Goindwal and the market value was assessed therein @ Rs.40,000/- per acre.

6.1 Furthermore, even no interference is called for with the impugned award at the instance of respondents-landowners in their cross-objections as both the two sale deeds produced by them are post notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act in the case in hand and the award dated 27.09.1986 Ex.A-X being relating to the same acquisition proceedings was rightly relied upon by the learned Reference Court.

6.2. However, it may be specifically noticed here that since the

award passed by the learned Reference Court in the case in hand was dated 02.06.2003 i.e. after 30.04.1982 and as such, the respondents-landowners shall be entitled for all statutory benefits/ interest including the interest on solatium as well as provided under the 1894 Act (Amended upto-date).

7. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the appeals filed at the instance of PSIEC are hereby dismissed and the cross-objections filed at the instance of landowners are partly accepted.

8. Pending application, if any, also stand disposed of.

02.12.2025  
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)  
JUDGE

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