

2026:PHHC:068777



CWP No.8326 of 2023 (O&amp;M)

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

160

CWP No.8326 of 2023 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:04.05.2026

HANSRAJ AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Vs

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA*

Present: Ms. Maninee, Advocate for  
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Abhinav Kalia, D.A.G., Haryana.

Ms. Surbhi Rana, Advocate for  
Mr. P.S. Saini, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

*HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)*

[1]. By way of the present writ petition, the petitioners seek a direction for payment of interest on the compensation amount in terms of Section 34 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1894 Act”). It is averred that the award under Section 11 of the 1894 Act was passed on 21.04.2011; however, the compensation amount was disbursed only between January 2021 and February 2021, and the statutory interest payable thereon remains unpaid.

[2]. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2 points out that even as on today, it is the petitioners, who are in possession of the subject land, thus are not entitled for award of interest in terms of Section 34 of the 1894 Act.



CWP No.8326 of 2023 (O&M)

[3]. In view of aforesaid fact and taking into account the exposition of law laid down by the Hon’ble Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 10.02.2026 passed in LPA No.452 of 2022 titled ‘*Rohit Dean and others Vs. State of Haryana and others*’ the petitioners cannot claim interest while having continued to occupy the subject land. Relevant portion is reproduced hereunder:

*“58. But it shall be noted that in the present case the issue is not qua the ownership of the land upto the date when the amount of compensation is paid. The question raised in the present case is that whether, despite the ownership of the State Government upon the land in question, during the same period which the appellants remained in the possession of the land in question which fact is proved from the revenue record brought before this Court, and the appellants were generating the financial benefit out of the same, the appellants can still claim for the grant of interest under Section 34 of the 1894 Act by pleading that prejudice has been caused to them by delayed payment of amount of compensation to them.*

*59. Once, the said revenue record depicting that benefits were being derived out of said land has not been rebutted so far, and such revenue record has the presumption of being true, the appellants who continued to occupy the land in question after passing of the Award dated 21.04.2011 till the date of payment of compensation, cannot claim for interest which grant of interest will amount to granting undue enrichment to the appellants at the hands of the Government.”*

[4]. In view thereof, the present writ petition being devoid of merits is thus dismissed.

[5]. Pending application(s), if any shall also stand disposed of.

May04, 2026  
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |