

2025:PHHC:129727



107 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RFA-2495-2002 (O&M)
Decided on:-10.09.2025

Ranjit Singh

...Appellant..

VS.

Land Acquisition Collector, SYL, Canal Project, Patiala
and another

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Naresh Kaushal, Advocate for the appellant.

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

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present appeal, challenge has been laid to an award dated 06.02.2002 passed by the Court of learned District Judge, Rupnagar whereby, petition under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as '**1894 Act**') filed at the instance of Karnail Singh (since deceased)-landowner seeking enhancement of compensation was partly allowed.

2. In the present case, some land owned by the appellant-landowner, falling in the revenue estate of Village Doomcheri, Tehsil and District Rupnagar, came to be acquired vide notification dated 07/17.10.1985 issued under Section 4 the 1894 Act, for the purpose of construction of Sutlej-Yamuna Link Canal. Award under Section 11 of the 1894 Act was passed by the Land Acquisition Collector on 28.06.1986, in

the following manner:-

Sr. No.	Kind of land	Rates per acre
1.	Chahi	Rs.72,500/-
2.	Barani	Rs.50,000/-
3.	Banjar Kadim	Rs.45,000/-
4.	Ghair Mumkin	Rs.40,000/-

3. Aggrieved thereof, the appellant-landowner filed reference petition under Section 18 of the Act seeking enhancement, which came to be disposed of vide award dated 06.02.2002, in terms of decision dated 07.12.2000 rendered by the Reference Court, in a bunch of petitions with lead case bearing LAC No.381/11.10.1988, titled as ***“Raunaq Singh vs. State of Punjab”***, wherein, the landowners were awarded the enhanced compensation at the following rates:-

Sr. No.	Kind of land	Rates per acre
1.	Chahi	Rs.1,05,000/-
2.	Barani	Rs.80,000/-
3.	Banjar Kadim	Rs.60,000/-
4.	Ghair Mumkin	Rs.47,000/-

4. Still aggrieved against the aforesaid award dated 06.02.2002, the present appeal has been preferred at the instance of appellant.

5. During the pendency of the present appeal, the other similarly placed landowners approached this Court by way of filing separate Regular First Appeals and the same were dismissed vide judgment dated 11.01.2010 passed in a bunch of appeals with lead case bearing ***RFA-3304-2006 (O&M)***, titled as ***“Malkiat Singh and others vs. Land Acquisition Collector and another”***.

6. Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the present appeal is squarely covered by decision dated 11.01.2010 passed in ***Malkiat***

Singh’s case (supra), whereby the appeals filed by other similarly placed landowners were dismissed and pray that the present appeal be also disposed of in terms of **Malkiat Singh’s** case (supra) thereof.

- 7. Ordered accordingly.
- 8. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

10.09.2025
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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