

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-1364-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.03.2026

THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR
AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

NETRAPAL KAUR AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

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

None for the respondents.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

By way of present revision petition, the challenge has been laid to the order dated 11.11.2025 (Annexure P-4) as well as order dated 05.01.2026 (Annexure P-6) passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Ludhiana-cum-Executing Court whereby, warrants of attachment were issued against the petitioner, besides dismissal of the application for recalling thereof.

2. In the present case, the dispute arises out of an execution application preferred at the instance of respondents/land owners, claiming themselves to be the co-sharers of the other land owners, who preferred objections under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (here-in-after referred to as 'the Act, 1894') and re-assessment of compensation was made in their favour in **LAC No.3/40** of **01.04.2006** titled as **Kamikkar Singh and others vs LAC** vide award dated 25.09.2012; later altered vide decision dated 22.07.2016 passed by this Court in **RFA No.1546 of 2015**.

3. The only contention raised on behalf of the petitioners is that no execution at the hands of respondents herein was maintainable as they neither preferred objections under Section 18 of the Act, 1894 nor even filed application under Section 28-A thereof.

4. No one has chosen to appear on behalf of the respondents.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and gone through the paper book and find no substance in the submissions made on behalf the petitioners.

6. In terms of the law laid down by Hon'ble the Apex Court in *Ramphal and others vs Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited and others (SLP(C) No(s).4532-4539 of 2023, decided on 13.01.2026*, an execution application preferred at the instance of co-sharer of the land-owner, who had preferred a reference under Section 18 of the Act, 1894, has been held to be maintainable.

7. In view thereof, the present revision petition, being devoid of merits, is thus dismissed.

8. However, the respondents shall be entitled for interest on the enhanced compensation only in terms of judgment passed in *Ramphal's* case (*supra*).

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

March 05, 2026

gurpreet

(HARKESH MANUJA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No