



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

210(3)

Decided on :17.04.2026

**RA-11-LPA-2005 in/and
LPA-438-2001 (O&M)**

SAT PAL AND ANOTHER

Versus

Review applicants

... Respondents

**RA-12-LPA-2005 in/and
LPA-439-2001 (O&M)**

MOHINDER SINGH

Versus

...Review applicants

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

**RA-LPA-9-LPA-2006 in/and
LPA-842-2001 (O&M)**

VARINDER SINGH AND ANOTHER

Versus

....Review applicants

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

PRESENT: Mr. B. S. Rana, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Nayandeep Rana, Advocate
for the review applicant-appellants.

Mr. Sandeep Chhabra, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

1. The present review applications, the details of which are mentioned in the heading, involve a common point of law and common set



**RA-11-LPA-2005 in/and
LPA-438-2001 (O&M) AND
CONNECTED**

2

of facts, hence, they are being dealt with together. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from RA-11-LPA-2005.

2. The present review application has been listed before this Court for recalling the judgment dated 21.09.2001 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, in view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal Nos. 6293-6298 of 2022, decided on 07.09.2022, whereby the order dated 17.01.2014 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in the review petition was set aside and a direction was issued to consider the review application afresh on merits.

3. Learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of review applicant submits that the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India is very much clear that the issue whether or not two similarly situated farmers can be treated differently needs to be decided and whether or not different compensation can be paid to the similarly situated farmers whose land has been acquired.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the review applicant further submits that the order passed by the review Bench, which has been set-aside by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, was non-speaking and therefore, the present review application needs to be decided by keeping in mind the order dated 07.09.2022 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel submits that as of now, keeping in view the amendments to the High Court Rules and Orders, no LPA lies against an order passed in Regular First Appeal and therefore, the LPA filed by the appellants was not maintainable and even the review filed for reviewing the order dated 21.09.2001 is also liable to be rejected.



**RA-11-LPA-2005 in/and
LPA-438-2001 (O&M) AND
CONNECTED 3**

6. Learned Senior counsel for the review applicant submits that on the date when the LPA was decided by the Division Bench initially i.e. on 21.09.2001, the same was permissible hence, the subsequent amendments to the High Court Rules and Orders will not take away the right of the review applicant to get the order dated 21.09.2001 reviewed.

7. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

8. It may be noticed that the present review applications are filed against the order passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in LPA-439-2001, which is reproduced as under:-

“For reasons recorded in our order dated 18.10.2000 dismissing Letters Patent Appeal No. 536 of 2000, Shishu Pal and another vs. State of Haryana and another, arising out of the common impugned judgment, we find no merit in the appeal.

Dismissed.”

9. A bare perusal of the above reproduction would show that the Division Bench though had dismissed the appeal in terms of an earlier order dated 18.10.2000 passed in Letters Patent Appeal No. 536 of 2000 but the facts of the present case and of that case so as to show that the same are covered or similar, have not been mentioned. Further, the issue being raised by the learned State counsel that the LPA was not admissible has also not been adjudicated by co-ordinate Bench.

10. Keeping in view the order dated 07.09.2022 passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India, the issue which was raised was that



**RA-11-LPA-2005 in/and
LPA-438-2001 (O&M) AND
CONNECTED 4**

whether or not two similarly situated farmers can be given different compensations for the land acquired in the same notification. The same has not been decided by giving the facts of the case, hence, the issue first needs to be decided by considering the facts of the present case, and by giving detailed reasons for the conclusion to be arrived at.

11. Further, whether or not the jurisdiction to file an appeal against the order passed in Regular First Appeal exists, also needs to be decided while deciding the LPA.

12. Hence, keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances, the review applications are allowed, and the order dated 21.09.2001 is hereby recalled.

13. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

**LPA-438-2001
LPA-439-2001
LPA-842-2001**

14. Keeping in view the order passed in the review applications recorded herein above, the present appeals are to be listed as per roster.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

**(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE**

17.04.2026

Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No