

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH****CWP-20515-2016 (O&M)****Date of Decision : 24.04.2026**

J.M. Oberoi and Another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI**

Present : None for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurabh Mago, DAG Haryana
for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4.Mr. Ankur Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate for respondent No.3.**ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)**

1. On 02.04.2026 the following order was passed :

“A writ petition being CWP-9260-2008 was filed by the petitioners challenging the acquisition on merits which was dismissed vide order dated 26.05.2008. Thereafter, a second petition being CWP-550-2015 was filed, which was disposed off vide order dated 26.03.2015 with a direction to decide the representation filed by the petitioners by passing a speaking order. Subsequently, a speaking order dated 06.07.2016 was passed, which has been challenged in the present writ petition.”

The only prayer in the present petition is that the acquisition proceedings have lapsed in view of the provisions of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short the '2013 Act'). The present petition was decided by this Court vide order dated 14.12.2016. Subsequently, the State of Haryana had filed Special Leave Petitions before the Supreme Court, the lead case being State of Haryana & Ors. Vs. Aalamgir & Ors. [(2025) 6 SCC 397]. The Supreme Court vide judgment dated 18.03.2025 in the case of Aalamgir (supra) remanded the present petition alongwith other matters for reconsideration.

Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.3 has pointed out that possession of the land in question was taken vide Rapat Roznamcha No.259 dated 05.02.2007 and compensation to the tune of ₹16,57,159/- was duly tendered by the Land Acquisition Collector at the time of announcement of the award.

Since none has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioners, let notice be issued to the petitioners through Civil Judge (Senior Division) concerned, returnable 24.04.2026.

To be shown in the urgent list."

2. As per office report, the petitioners stand duly served, however, none has put in appearance on their behalf despite the case being called twice.

3. In view of the above, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss the present petition for non-prosecution.

4. Dismissed for non-prosecution. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
jk

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO