

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

111

**CM-2030-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-811-2026 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 02.04.2026****State of Haryana and others****... Appellants****Versus****Divya Buildcon Private Limited****... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA****Present:** Ms. Anu Pal, Addl. A.G. Haryana
for the appellant.

Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate for the respondent/caveator.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)**CM-2030-LPA-2026**

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 124 days in filing the appeal.

Heard. For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed and delay of 124 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

Main case

The present appeal has been filed against the order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 14.10.2025 in CWP-4499-2021 by which, the statutory interest on the compensation for the period 09.12.2016 to 18.05.2018 has been granted.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the delay in release of compensation is not attributable to the appellants as certain objections were duly pointed out towards disbursement of compensation before the learned Land



Acquisition Collector vide written objections dated 04.01.2017 and the matter was thereupon forwarded to the Reference Court on 17.04.2018 in exercise of powers under Section 30 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as '1894 Act') and thus, the respondent herein was not entitled to any interest as per Section 80 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as '2013 Act'). Therefore, the order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 14.10.2025 may kindly be set aside.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the State and have gone through the record with her able assistance.

4. A bare perusal of impugned order dated 14.10.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge would show that the interest on the amount of compensation awarded has been given for that period when the compensation was not released. Further, the said interest is the statutory interest as mentioned in the '2013 Act'.

5. Further, the interest has been granted upon the compensation as due to the delay in reimbursement of the same, even as per the provision of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, the land-owners are entitled to such interest for delayed release of compensation awarded for the land. Once, learned counsel for the appellant has not been able to rebut that there was a delay on the part of the appellant in releasing the compensation, the directions given by the learned Single Judge to grant the interest on the compensation, cannot be treated as perverse either to the facts or settled principle of law.

6. Further, the learned State counsel was requested to point out the perversity in the impugned order dated 14.10.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge. No perversity has been shown to this Court so as to seek any intervention by this Court to the order passed by the learned Single Judge.

7. As per the settled principle of law, in appeal, the interference can only be



done in case the impugned order is perverse either on facts or on law and in case present case the learned State counsel has not been able to point out any perversity either on facts or on law hence, no ground is made out to allow the present appeal.

- 8. The present appeal stands dismissed.
- 9. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

02.04.2026
sapna adhikari

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No