

CR No.2877 of 2023 (O&M)

2026:PHHC:064703



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

148

CR No.2877 of 2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision:28.04.2026

THE ESTATE OFFICER, HUDA (NOW HSVP), KAITHAL.....Petitioner
Vs
AMARJIT SINGH AND ORS.Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)

[1]. By way of present revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, challenge has been laid to the order dated 13.09.2022 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Kaithal-cum-Executing Court, whereby respondent No.1 being a co-sharer in the acquired land, was held entitled to the grant of similar benefits of enhanced compensation of Rs.280/- per square yards along with all statutory benefits under the relevant provisions of the Act, in terms of the Award dated 14.05.2009 passed by the learned Reference Court in L.A. Case No.261 of 2006 titled '*Jagdev Singh Vs. State of Haryana.*'

[2]. Being aggrieved thereof, the petitioner preferred the present revision petition.

[3]. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that once the private respondent/landowner did not choose to prefer reference under Section 18 or 28-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, he could not have been awarded the benefit of enhanced market value determined in favour of other co-sharers for the acquired land merely by preferring an execution application.



CR No.2877 of 2023 (O&M)

[4]. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book.

[5]. The aforesaid legal issue already stands decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court vide decision dated 13.01.2026 passed in ***Civil Appeal No(s).391 - 398 of 2026 (@ SLP (C) No(S).4532-4539 of 2023)***, titled ***"Ramphal & Ors. Versus Haryana State Industrial And Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited & Ors"***, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has been pleased to uphold the claims made by the co-sharers with regard to entitlement of similar amount of compensation as granted in favour of their co-owners in the acquired land, however, restricted the award of interest. Relevant paras 11 to 14 from the aforesaid decision dated 13.01.2026 are extracted hereunder:-

"11. In fact, we have been informed at the Bar by the learned counsel appearing for the appellants, which is not seriously disputed by the learned senior counsel appearing for the respondents, the fact that the land which was acquired, has been utilized for the purposes of formation of industrial sites and allotted to the needy persons in accordance with the Rules then prevalent. In other words, the acquiring body is also benefited to certain extent, which is an instrumentality of the State. Thus, the scales have to be balanced in this scenario.

12. We are of the considered view that apart from the compensation, the appellants would be entitled to the interest for a period of five years to be reckoned from today backwards and we make it explicitly clear that the appellants are not entitled for any interest for any other period. We would also hasten to add that the appellants would be entitled to all other consequential benefits which flow from award of compensation and the respondent(s) authorities shall compute the compensation as has been determined by the award passed under Section 18 of the Act and/or modified by the High Court or this Court in exercise of appellate jurisdiction.

13. The said determination shall be made by the authorities expeditiously and at any rate within an outer limit of three months from the date of this order and the amounts so determined shall be disbursed within an outer limit of three months for such determination with interest as specified therein.

14. In the event of time line which has been fixed by this Court is not adhered to by the respondent(s) authorities, they shall be liable to pay interest



@ nine per cent (9%) on the amounts so determined from the date of such determination.”

[6]. In view of the aforesaid decision rendered by the Hon’ble Apex Court, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

[7]. The learned Executing Court is requested to expedite the release of compensation amount in favour of respondent No.1-landowner while keeping in view the specific and categoric directions issued in Ramphal’s case (supra), especially when it has not been disputed by the petitioner(s) that respondent No.1 - landowner happened to be the co-sharers of the applicant(s) who preferred references under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and enhancement was ordered in their favour. Respondent No.1-landowner shall also be entitled to the award of market value which was finally determined with respect to the related acquisition.

[8]. Though the present revision petition is being dismissed without effecting service upon respondent No.1 due to non-deposit of process fee by learned counsel for the petitioner, especially in view of latest exposition of law vide which the point of law involved in the present revision petition already stands determined by the Hon’ble Apex Court in Ramphal’s case (supra), however respondent No.1/landowner would be at liberty to move an appropriate application before this Court in case, he finds any misstatement of fact on the part of the petitioner.

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

April 28, 2026
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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