

2026:PHHC:010325



CR No.1951 of 2021 (O&M)

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

138

CR No.1951 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision:23.01.2026

HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITYPetitioners

Vs

MAHABIR AND ORS

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for the petitioners (through VC).

Mr. Akshay Jindal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Pankaj Gautam, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Anuj Garg, D.A.G., Haryana.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)

[1]. By way of present revision petition, challenge has been laid to the orders dated 12.12.2015 and 12.09.2019 passed by the learned Executing Court, whereby respondent No.1/landowner being a co-sharer in the acquired land, was found entitled for the award of similar benefits of enhanced compensation to the tune of Rs.2,24,97,003/- per acre along with all statutory benefits under the relevant provisions of the Act in terms of decision passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal nos.11913-11945 of 2017.

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

[3]. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that once respondent No.1 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



CR No.1951 of 2021 (O&M)

market value determined in favour of other co-sharers for the acquired land merely by preferring an execution application.

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

[5]. The issue raised by the petitioner now stands finally determined by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of 'Ramphal & Ors. Vs. Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited & Ors.' decided on 13.01.2026 by upholding the claim of the co-sharers, however restricting the award of interest. The relevant paragraphs Nos.12 to 14 of the aforementioned judgment are extracted hereunder:-

"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."



CR No.1951 of 2021 (O&M)

[6]. In view of adjudication made by the Hon’ble Apex Court in the
aforementioned case of *Ramphal & Ors.* (supra), the present petition is disposed of.
As directed by the Hon’ble Apex Court, the petitioner shall disburse the amount of
compensation in favour of the respondent No.1/landowner within three months
from today. In case the needful is not done, respondents shall be liable to pay a
litigation cost(s) of Rs.50,000/- per month in favour of respondent No.1, over and
above the interest ordered by the Hon’ble Apex Court. The cost imposed by this
Court shall be borne by the official responsible for the delay and shall bear it from
own pocket.

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

January 23, 2026
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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