



RFA Nos.1482 & 1710 of 1996 (O&M) & 1465 of 1997 (O&M)

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

106

1. RFA No.1482 of 1996 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.02.2026
DARSHAN SINGH AND ANR.Appellants

Vs

**THE STATE OF PUNJAB THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION
COLLECTOR, SYL CANAL PROJECT** ...Respondent(s)

2. RFA No.1710 of 1996 (O&M)
HARBANS SINGH AND ORS.Appellants

Vs

**THE STATE OF PUNJAB THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION
COLLECTOR, SYL CANAL PROJECT** ...Respondent(s)

3. RFA No.1465 of 1997 (O&M)
GURCHARAN SINGHAppellant

Vs

**THE STATE OF PUNJAB THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION
COLLECTOR, SYL CANAL PROJECT** ...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Nitish Kaushal, Advocate
for the appellants/landowners.

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

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)

[1]. Vide this common order, the aforementioned Regular First Appeals, are being decided as same have arisen out of common acquisition/Award involving identical facts and question of law. For the sake of brevity, facts are being taken from RFA No.1482 of 1996.

[2]. By way of present appeal, challenge has been laid to the Award dated 07.03.1996 passed by the learned Addl. District Judge, Rupnagar (hereinafter to be referred as the 'Reference Court').

[3]. Briefly stating, in the present case(s), land measuring 5.03 acres (actually 4.97 acres) situated within the revenue estate of village Chatauli, Hadbast



RFA Nos.1482 & 1710 of 1996 (O&M) & 1465 of 1997 (O&M)

No.125, Tehsil Kharar, District Rupnagar, came to be acquired vide Notifications dated 21.03.1988 and 05/06.04.1988 issued under Sections 4 & 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short the '1894 Act') respectively for the public purpose namely for construction of S.Y.L. Canal. Award under Section 11 of the 1894 Act was passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (for short 'the LAC') on 16.05.1989, thereby determining the market value of the acquired land in the following manner:-

<i>"1. Chahi</i>	<i>Rs.50,000/- per acre</i>
<i>2. Barani</i>	<i>Rs.40,000/- per acre</i>
<i>3. Gair Mumkin</i>	<i>Rs.30,000/- per acre"</i>

[4]. Being dissatisfied with the aforesaid award, the appellants/ landowners filed reference petition invoking Section 18 of the Act, which came to be partly accepted by the learned Reference Court while enhancing the market value of the acquired land, in the following manner:-

<i>"1. Chahi</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>Rs.1,00,000/- per acre</i>
<i>2. Barani</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>Rs.80,000/- per acre</i>
<i>3. Gair Mumkin land</i>	<i>:</i>	<i>Rs.60,000/- per acre"</i>

[5]. Still aggrieved of the decision of the learned Reference Court, the present appeals were preferred at the instance of appellants/ landowners.

[6]. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book as well as records of the case(s).

[7]. A perusal of the record shows that this Court vide decision dated 06.01.2016 passed by this Court in **RFA No.1725 of 1996 and connected matters**, titled '**Ranjit Singh vs. The State of Punjab and another**' assessed market value of the land acquired @ Rs.1,80,000/- per acre for the notification of even date i.e. 21.03.1988 pertaining to the revenue estate of village Bhago Majra, Teshil and District Rupnagar, wherein the acquisition was carried out for the public purpose



i.e. for the construction of Krishan Pura Right Distributory. A perusal of the record in the form of deposition of AW-2 Lal Singh, Halqa Patwari, Chatauli, shows that the revenue estates of villages Bhago Majra and Chatauli are in close proximity, therefore, in the humble opinion of the Court, the appellants/landowners are also entitled for the award of same market value as has been awarded by this Court in relation to the acquisition carried out in the revenue estate of village Bhago Majra.

[8]. In view thereof, the present appeals are disposed of in the same terms of decision dated 06.01.2016 passed in Ranjit Singh's case (*supra*) and the market value in the present case(s) as well is, thus assessed @ Rs.1,80,000/- per acre in favour of the appellants/landowners. In addition, the landowners shall also be entitled for award of all statutory benefits and interest as provided under the provisions of the 1894 Act (amended upto to date). The landowners shall also be entitled for solatium @ 30% besides award of interest thereupon as well.

[9]. Needless to mention here that wherever the landowner(s) has/have unfortunately expired in the appeal(s)/cross-objection(s) after filing thereof and the legal heirs have not been impleaded, they shall be at liberty to seek execution of the present decision by moving appropriate application(s) before the learned Executing Court.

[10]. Disposed of on the above terms. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

February 06, 2026
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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