



286-Urgent + 288-Urgent + 291-Urgent

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

**(1) Civil Writ Petition No. 15293 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.05.2026**

DD Auto Private Limited, New Delhi
..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another
..... Respondents

(2) Civil Writ Petition No. 15341 of 2026 (O&M)

Daulat Ram Dharam Bir Auto Private Limited,
New Delhi
..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another
..... Respondents

AND

(3) Civil Writ Petition No. 15396 of 2026 (O&M)

M/s. Forging PLTD, Delhi
..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another
..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in all cases).

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

This order shall dispose of the present three (03) writ petitions
bearing CWP Nos. **15293 (lead case)**, 15341 & 15396 of **2026**, as the same
involve common questions of law and facts.

[2] By way of present writ petition(s), prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner(s) for adjudication of application dated 04.10.2021 / 06.01.2021 preferred at its instance under Section 28-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (**for short “the Act”**), whereby the claim was set up for award of similar benefit as assessed in favour of other identically placed landowners vide judgment dated 13.07.2021 / 14.07.2021 passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Civil Appeal No. 2903 of 2021*, titled “***Banwari Lal & Anr. Versus State of Haryana & Ors.***”, and the market value with respect to the same acquisition pertaining to Villages Neemka and Fajjupur Majra Neemka, District Faridabad was assessed at the rate of Rs.2,186/- per square yard and Rs. 2,509/- per square yard respectively.

[3] At the outset, on the oral request made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s), The Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran, through its Administrator, Panchkula, is ordered to be impleaded as party respondent No. 3.

[3.1] Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) undertakes to furnish amended memo of parties with the Registry of this Court within seven days from today.

[3.2] Upon doing so, Registry to do the needful.

[4] The short grouse made on behalf of the petitioner(s) is that for the past almost five years, despite repeated reminders, the application preferred at its instance, is not being adjudicated upon by respondent No. 2-LAC, Faridabad.

[5] Notice of motion.

[6] On asking of the Court, Ms. Komal Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 & 2, whereas Mr. Harmanjot Singh Gill, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of newly added respondent No. 3-HSVP in all cases.

[7] Learned State Counsel, on instructions from Sh. Naveen, LAC, informs that the application preferred at the instance of petitioner(s) in terms of Section 28-A of the Act shall be heard while affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner(s) or its representative by respondent No. 2 on 22.05.2026 at 11.00 a.m.; a speaking order in terms thereof shall be passed within one week thereafter and a copy thereof shall also be supplied to the petitioner(s) within a week from the passing of the order.

[8] Learned counsel(s) for the respondent(s) also assure that while passing of the order, the latest exposition of law by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in a decision dated 25.03.2026, passed in *SLP(C) No. 2587-2593 of 2021*, titled “*Andanayya and others Versus Deputy Chief Engineer and others*”, shall be taken into account.

[9] In view of the aforesaid stand taken by the learned counsel(s) for the respondent(s), no further orders are required to be passed in the present writ petition(s), the same are **disposed of** accordingly.

[10] It is also directed that in case the petitioner(s)-landowner(s) are found entitled for the award of similar benefit of the market value as assessed in *Banwari Lal's case (supra)*, respondent No. 3-HSVP shall ensure through Chief Controller of Finance, HSVP, Panchkula that the due amount payable to the petitioner(s)-landowner(s) is released in their favour within four weeks from the passing of the speaking order(s) by respondent

No. 2-LAC, Faridabad.

[11] It is made clear that in case the needful is not done, the Chief Controller of Finance, HSVP, Panchkula shall be liable to pay costs of Rs. 2 lakh to the petitioner(s) from his/her own pocket and shall not be treated as a burden on the State Exchequer, besides the petitioner(s) shall be at liberty to seek revival of the present petition(s).

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

May 18, 2026
'dk kamra'

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>