



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

CR-191-2022

Date of decision : 08.05.2025

Surajbhan

...Petitioner

Vs.

Nihal Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Raj K. Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner herein assails the correctness of the order passed by the Additional District Judge on 13.03.2020 while deciding reference under Section 3-H(4) of National Highways Act, 1956.
2. In substance, the petitioner claims to be permanent lessee of the acquired property. The Additional District Judge has directed apportionment between the petitioner and owner in the ratio of 75:25. In other words, the petitioner has been held entitled to 3/4th of the compensation.
3. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that he being the permanent lessee was entitled to total compensation. He was requested to substantiate the same, however, he failed to do so.
4. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground to interfere is made out.
5. Hence, the revision petition is dismissed.

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

08.05.2025

neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes

Yes

No

No