



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

**CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND
RA-RF-39-2021 in
RFA-2600-2001**

**Bahadur Chand (since deceased)
through his LR Ravinder Kumar**

. . . . Applicant-Appellant

Vs.

State of Haryana through Collector and another

. . . . Respondents

**Reserved on: 29.01.2026
Pronounced on: 02.02.2026
Pronounced fully/ Operative: Fully**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Argued by: - Mr. Puneet Jindal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rohit Sharma, Advocate
For the applicant(s)-appellant(s) in
CM-1844-CI-2025 in/and RA-RF-39-2021 in RFA-2600-2001.

Mr. Y.P. Malik, Advocate with
Mr. Ankur Malik, Advocate for the
Applicant(s)-appellant(s) in rest of cases.

Mr. Gaurav Garg, AAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

This order shall dispose of twenty-four review applications filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 read with Sections 114 and 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, seeking reconsideration of the judgment dated 29.11.2006 rendered in the Regular First Appeals of the applicants, which along with other connected appeals, were decided by a common order on the said date. The judgment dated 29.11.2006 was subsequently reviewed and modified by a Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 05.08.2008, whereby the



CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND
RA-RF-39-2021 in
RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases

market value of the acquired land was reassessed and fixed at ₹206/- per square yard.

2. The present review applicants seek further enhancement of compensation on the basis of parity with the landowners in whose favour the Hon’ble Supreme Court, vide judgment dated 26.02.2016 passed in Civil Appeal Nos. 1863-1865 of 2016 titled **M/s Arti Spinning Mills etc. v. State of Haryana and another**, enhanced the compensation to ₹16,08,000/- per acre, equivalent to ₹332.23 per square yard, though without statutory benefits for the period of delay.

3. Out of the twenty-four review applications, twenty-three are accompanied by separate applications seeking condonation of delay of 4825 days, whereas in one application the delay sought to be condoned is of 3774 days.

4. Following table will give the details of the RFAs of the as disposed of in the bunch on 29.11.2006 modified on 05.08.2008 in earlier review applications besides the review applications number and miscellaneous civil applications moved in separate review applications so as to condone the delay besides the period of delay:

Sr. No.	RFA No.	Title	Review Appl. No.	CM Number to condone delay	Period of delay (days)
1.	2600 of 2001	Bahadur Chand Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-39 of 2021	5499-CI-2021	4825
2.	4646 of 2001	Harjinder & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-45 of 2021	5507-CI-2021	4825
3.	2768 of 2001	Sujan & Anr. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-43 of 2021	5505-CI-2021	4825
4.	3006 of 2001	Ravinder & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-44 of 2021	5508-CI-2021	4825
5.	2602 of 2001	Ram Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-42 of 2021	5503-CI-2021	4825
6.	3559 of 2001	Raj Singh Vs. State of	RA-RF-40 of	5500-CI-2021	4825



CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND
RA-RF-39-2021 in
RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases

		Haryana & Anr.	2021		
7.	3004 of 2001	Joginder & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-41 of 2021	5502-CI-2021	4825
8.	2593 of 2001	Bishan & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-46 of 2021	5509-CI-2021	4825
9.	2967 of 2001	Bhawnesh Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-47 of 2021	5510-CI-2021	4825
10.	2604 of 2001	Balbir & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-48 of 2021	5511-CI-2021	4825
11.	3003 of 2001	Tara Singh Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-49 of 2021	5512-CI-2021	4825
12.	3563 of 2001	Lakhwinder & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-55 of 2021	5513-CI-2021	4825
13.	2595 of 2001	Moti Ram & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-51 of 2021	5515-CI-2021	4825
14.	3560 of 2001	Manjeet & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-52 of 2021	5517-CI-2021	4825
15.	2599 of 2001	Bhim & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-53 of 2021	5519-CI-2021	4825
16	3002 of 2001	Mukhtiar Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-54 of 2021	5521-CI-2021	4825
17.	3005 of 2001	Hans Raj & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-55 of 2021	5527-CI-2021	4825
18.	2601 of 2001	Ram Kumar Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-56 of 2021	5720-CI-2021	4825
19.	2603 of 2001	Balbir & Anr. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-57 of 2021	5721-CI-2021	4825
20.	3558 of 2001	Kulwant & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-58 of 2021	5722-CI-2021	4825
21.	2592 of 2001	Jasvir Kaur & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-64 of 2021	5900-CI-2021	4825



CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND
RA-RF-39-2021 in
RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases

22.	4209 of 2001	Soma Wanti & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-65 of 2021	5946-CI-2021	4825
23.	2605 of 2001	Parkash & Ors. Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-67 of 2021	5949-CI-2021	4825
24.	623 of 2002	Raj Kumar Vs. State of Haryana & Anr.	RA-RF-66 of 2021	5948-CI-2021	3774

5. The substantive controversy arises out of the compulsory acquisition of 137.74 acres of land situated in the revenue estates of villages Mauja Maqdam Jagdan, Mauja Patti Taraf Insar, Sarai Bachhra, Azizullapur and Nizampur in District Panipat. Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act was issued on 02.03.1993 for development and establishment of Sector-18, Panipat, followed by declaration under Section 6 dated 01.03.1994. The Land Acquisition Collector, vide award dated 28.02.1996, assessed the market value of the acquired lands differently depending upon the location and nature of the land. Dissatisfied landowners sought references under Section 18 of the Act. The Reference Court, relying upon the judgment of this Court in **Jogi Ram v. State of Haryana, 1997 (2) PLR 303**, and keeping in view the time gap between the notifications involved therein and the present acquisition, assessed the market value at ₹185.60 per square yard and granted all statutory benefits.

6. Appeals were thereafter filed by both the landowners and the State. A Coordinate Bench of this Court, in a bunch of appeals led by **RFA No. 2600 of 2001** titled **Bahadur Chand v. State of Haryana**, decided on 29.11.2006, reassessed the market value at ₹185.60 per square yard by placing reliance upon another judgment of even date rendered in RFA 1379 of 1994 '**Nand Lal & another v. State of Haryana & another**'. Still dissatisfied, the landowners approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Noticing that the judgment relied upon by the High Court had already been reviewed, the



CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND

RA-RF-39-2021 in

RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases

Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 21.09.2007 permitted withdrawal of the special leave petitions with liberty to approach the High Court.

7. Pursuant thereto, a Division Bench of this Court, in a bunch of review petitions led by ***Review Petition No. 84-CI of 2007 in RFA No. 2600 of 2001, decided on 05.08.2008***, undertook a fresh assessment and enhanced the market value of the acquired land to ₹206/- per square yard.

8. The applicants concede that they challenged the order dated 05.08.2008 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing ***SLP (Civil) CC Nos. 4457-4466 of 2010***. The said special leave petitions were dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 29.03.2010 with the specific observation that the same were dismissed "*on the ground of delay and also on merits*".

9. The further case sought to be projected by the applicants is that other landowners, whose land is claimed to have been acquired under the same Government notification as in the present case, had approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing Civil Appeal Nos. 1863–1865 of 2016 (arising out of SLP (C) Nos. 30933–30935 of 2015) titled ***M/s Arti Spinning Mills etc. v. State of Haryana and another***. The said appeals were allowed vide judgment dated 26.02.2016, whereby the market value of the land involved therein was fixed at ₹16,08,000/- per acre, equivalent to ₹332.23 per square yard. However, the landowners in the said case were denied statutory benefits for a period of 2411 days, covering the delay before the High Court as well as before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

10. On the strength of the aforesaid judgment dated 26.02.2016, the applicants seek reconsideration of their claim and pray for enhancement of compensation on the basis of parity.

11. As noticed earlier that 23 of the review applications are accompanied by the applications to condone the delay of 4825 days; whereas in one of the application delay of 3774 days is sought to be condoned.



CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND

RA-RF-39-2021 in

RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases

12. The State has filed separate replies to all the applications seeking condonation of delay, opposing the same on the ground that the applicants cannot be permitted to reap the benefit of enhancement granted in favour of other landowners by filing highly belated review applications after a lapse of more than thirteen years. It is contended that such an inordinate delay does not warrant any indulgence by this Court, particularly when the judgment relied upon by the applicants, namely *M/s Arti Spinning Mills etc. v. State of Haryana*, does not pertain to the same acquisition.

13. Apart from opposing the applications for condonation of delay, the State has also contested the main review applications on the ground of maintainability.

14. It is submitted on behalf of the State that the judgment dated 05.08.2008 passed by a Division Bench of this Court in Review Application No. 84-CI of 2007 in RFA No. 2600 of 2001 titled *Bahadur Chand v. State of Haryana and another* was assailed by the applicants before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing SLP (Civil) Nos. 4457–4466 of 2010, which were dismissed on 29.03.2010. It is contended that once the challenge to the said judgment stood concluded before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the present review applications seeking further enhancement of compensation are not maintainable. It is further urged that while the judgments dated 29.11.2006 and 05.08.2008 relied upon by the applicants relate to the same notification as in the present case, the judgment dated 26.02.2016 rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M/s Arti Spinning Mills etc.* pertains to a different acquisition altogether and, therefore, the applicants cannot claim parity on the basis thereof.

15. Learned counsel for the State has further pointed out during the course of arguments that the reliance placed on *M/s Arti Spinning Mills* is misplaced, as the enhancement therein was granted by drawing parity with the judgment dated 29.05.2009 passed in *RFA No. 363 of 2005 titled Ram Chand @ Ram Chander v. State of Haryana and others*, which arose out of a



CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND

RA-RF-39-2021 in

RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases

notification issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act dated 12.09.2001. In contrast, the present acquisition was initiated vide notification dated 02.03.1993, thus relating to an entirely different acquisition in point of time.

16. It has also been emphasized that the judgment dated 26.02.2016 in *M/s Arti Spinning Mills* was subsequently clarified by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 13.05.2016, whereby it was expressly held that the compensation awarded therein was confined to the facts of that case alone and would not have any precedential value. On these premises, it is contended that the claim for similar compensation raised by the review applicants is wholly misconceived and liable to be rejected. Accordingly, a prayer has been made for dismissal of all the applications.

17. In response, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the applicants submits that the land belonging to *M/s Arti Spinning Mills* was also acquired under the same notification, under which the land of the present applicants was acquired and, therefore, they are entitled to enhancement of compensation on the basis of parity. It is further contended that the special leave petitions filed by the applicants before the Hon'ble Supreme Court were not decided on merits but were dismissed on the ground of delay and, as such, the present review applications are maintainable. In support of this submission, reliance has been placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Khoday Distilleries Ltd. v. Sri Mahadeshwara Sahakara Sakkare Karkhane Ltd., Kollegal, 2019 (4) SCC 376.***

18. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the record.

19. So far as the applications seeking condonation of delay are concerned, this Court finds no justification whatsoever to exercise discretion in favour of the applicants. The delay of 4825 days in twenty-three cases and 3774 days in one case is not merely inordinate but wholly unexplained and strikes at the very root of finality of judicial proceedings. The applicants were



CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND

RA-RF-39-2021 in

RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases

fully conscious of their rights and remedies, having actively pursued the matter up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, where their special leave petitions were dismissed on merits as well as on the ground of delay.

20. Having allowed the litigation to attain finality more than a decade ago, the applicants cannot now be permitted to revive a closed chapter on the strength of a subsequent judgment rendered in a different factual matrix. It is well settled that delay defeats equity, and the law of limitation is founded upon public policy to ensure certainty, repose, and stability in legal relations. In land acquisition matters, where compensation is determined after multiple tiers of adjudication, entertaining such belated claims would open floodgates of stale litigation and render the concept of finality illusory. The explanation offered does not constitute "sufficient cause" within the meaning of law, and mere reliance upon a later judgment does not furnish a legally sustainable ground for condonation.

21. The delay applications, therefore, deserve rejection on this ground alone.

22. Adverting to merits, the first question which arises for consideration is the maintainability of the present review applications. Once the order dated 05.08.2008 was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the special leave petitions were dismissed not only on the ground of delay but also on merits, the judgment attained finality and merged with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

23. In such circumstances, a further review of the same judgment is clearly impermissible. The scope of review under Order XLVII Rule 1 CPC is extremely limited and does not permit re-agitation of issues, which have already been finally adjudicated upon. The reliance placed by learned Senior Counsel for the applicants on ***Khoday Distilleries Ltd. v. Mahadeshwara Sahakara Sakkare Karkhane Ltd.*** is misplaced, as the said principle applies to cases where special leave petitions are dismissed without assigning reasons, which is not the situation in the present case.



**CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND
RA-RF-39-2021 in
RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases**

24. Even otherwise, the claim of parity based upon the judgment dated 26.02.2016 rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M/s Arti Spinning Mills* does not advance the case of the applicants. A perusal of the said judgment reveals that enhancement was granted therein by extending parity with the landowners in RFA No. 363 of 2005 titled '*Ram Chand @ Ram Chander v. State of Haryana*', decided by this court on 29.05.2009. Perusal of order dated 29.05.2009 in RFA No. 363 of 2005 titled '*Ram Chand @ Ram Chander (supra)*' reveals that the acquisition in that case was initiated vide notification dated 12.09.2001 under Section 4 of the Act, whereas the present acquisition pertains to a notification dated 02.03.1993. The time gap of more than eight years between the two acquisitions itself renders the claim of parity legally untenable.

25. Furthermore, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while clarifying its judgment dated 26.02.2016, vide order dated 13.05.2016, categorically held that the compensation awarded in *M/s Arti Spinning Mills* was confined to the facts of that case and shall not have any precedential value. Once the Supreme Court itself has declared that the judgment shall not be treated as a precedent, the applicants cannot seek enhancement of compensation by invoking parity on the basis thereof.

26. Even assuming for the sake of argument that the land involved in *Arti Spinning Mills* was acquired under the same notification, the express declaration of non-precedential value by Hon'ble Supreme Court bars any such claim.

27. Apart from the above, the review applications suffer from gross delay running into more than a decade, as has been found earlier, for which no satisfactory explanation has been furnished. Land acquisition proceedings cannot be kept alive indefinitely by repeatedly seeking re-determination of compensation on the basis of subsequent judgments rendered in different factual contexts. The doctrine of finality of litigation, coupled with the principle that equity does not aid the indolent, squarely applies.



**CM-5499-CI-2021 IN/AND
RA-RF-39-2021 in
RFA-2600-2001 & other connected cases**

28. In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Court finds no merit in any of the review applications.
29. Consequently, all twenty-four review applications along with the applications seeking condonation of delay are hereby dismissed. All pending application (s) also stand (s) disposed of.

02.02.2026
Jiten

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

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

Uploaded on: 02.02.2026