



CR No.2282 of 2021 (O&M) with connected cases

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

140+163+168

1.

CR No.2282 of 2021 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:11.02.2026

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.  
Vs  
HARI RAM AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners  
....Respondents
2.

CR No.1310 of 2024 (O&M)

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.  
Vs  
LAXMI AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners  
....Respondents
3.

CR No.7081 of 2024 (O&M)

HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (NOW HSVP)  
Vs  
RANJEET KAUR AND ORS.

.....Petitioner  
....Respondents
4.

CR No.7103 of 2024 (O&M)

HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (NOW HSVP)  
Vs  
NARESH AND ORS.

.....Petitioner  
....Respondents
5.

CR No.7262 of 2024 (O&M)

HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (NOW HSVP)  
Vs  
SUKHVINDER SINGH AND ORS.

.....Petitioner  
....Respondents

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

Present: Ms. Komal Sharma, D.A.G., Haryana  
for the petitioner(s) in CR Nos.2282 of 2021 & 1310 of 2024.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s) in CR Nos.7081, 7103 and 7262 of 2024

Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate  
for the respondent(s)/landowner(s).

\*\*\*\*

*HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)*

This order shall dispose of the present five revision petitions bearing  
CR Nos. 2282 of 2021 (O&M) & 1310, 7081, 7103 and 7262 of 2024 (O&M), as



**CR No.2282 of 2021 (O&M) with connected cases**

the same arise out of a common issue. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being culled out from CR No. 2282 of 2021 (O&M).

[1]. By way of present revision petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, challenge has been laid to the order dated 06.04.2021 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Rewari-cum-Executing Court, whereby the private respondents/landowners being co-sharers in the acquired land, were found entitled to the grant of similar benefits of enhanced compensation along with all statutory benefits under the relevant provisions of the Act, as was granted to their co-sharers in the acquired land in terms of Award dated 30.03.2016 passed in **L.A. Case No.1 of 2013 (Ex.P-4) titled ‘Dayanand Vs. State of Haryana and others’**.

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

[3]. Learned State counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that once the private respondents/landowners did not choose to prefer reference under Section 18 or 28-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, they 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.

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

[5]. In view of the latest exposition of law 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 Supreme Court has been pleased to uphold the claims made



**CR No.2282 of 2021 (O&M) with connected cases**

by the co-sharers with regard to seeking of similar amount of compensation as granted in favour of co-owners in the acquired land, however, restricted the award of interest. The relevant paragraphs Nos.11 to 14 of the aforementioned judgment 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.”*



CR No.2282 of 2021 (O&M) with connected cases

[6]. In view of the adjudication made by the Hon’ble Apex Court in the  
aforementioned case of *Ramphal & Ors.* (supra), the present revision petitions  
being devoid of merits, are hereby dismissed.

[7]. The learned Executing Court is requested to expedite the release of  
compensation amount in favour of respondent(s)-landowner(s) 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 the respondent(s)-  
landowner(s) 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. The respondent(s)-landowner(s) shall also be entitled  
to the award of market value which was finally determined with respect to the  
related acquisition.

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

February 11, 2026  
*Atik*

(HARKESH MANUJA)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |