



RFA Nos.2567 and 3625 of 1998 (O&M)

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

114

1.

RFA No.2567 of 1998 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.11.2025

THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

.....Appellants

Vs

ABHEY RAM

...Respondent(s)

2.

RFA No.3625 of 1998 (O&M)

ABHEY RAM

.....Appellant

Vs

THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA*

Present: Mr. Abhinash Jain, D.A.G., Haryana.
for the appellants.

Mr. Sandeep Punchhi, Advocate
for the respondent/landowner.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)

[1]. Vide this common order, both the aforementioned appeals are being decided as the same have arisen out of common acquisition/Award involving identical facts and question of law.

[2]. Briefly stating, vide Award dated 08.05.1998 passed by the learned Addl. District Judge, Hisar (hereinafter to be referred as the 'Reference Court'), Reference Petition filed under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short 'the 1894 Act') at the instance of the landowner was partly allowed and the claimant-Abhey Ram was held entitled to be paid Rs.27147.72 paise as compensation in respect of trees standing on the acquired land along with interest



RFA Nos.2567 and 3625 of 1998 (O&M)

@ 12% per annum for the period commencing from the date of issuance of preliminary notification dated 21.12.1990 under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 till the date of passing of the award.

[3]. Aggrieved thereof, RFA No.3625 of 1998 has been preferred at the instance of the landowner seeking enhancement of compensation towards trees, whereas the cross-appeal i.e. RFA No.2567 of 1998 has been filed by the respondent/State opposing the prayer made on behalf of the appellant/landowner.

[4]. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book.

[5]. A perusal of the record shows that the compensation with respect to the trees has been awarded in favour of the appellant/landowner based on the report Ex.P-7 submitted by the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Hisar as per records available with the Authorities in relation to the acquisition of land. Neither the landowner nor even the respondent/State has been able to point out any discrepancy towards the aforementioned report Ex.P-7.

[6]. In view thereof, no interference is called for in the Award passed by the learned Reference Court. Consequently, both the appeals stand dismissed.

[7]. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

November 07, 2025
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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