



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

130

Date of Decision: 01.07.2026

1. CWP-18550-2026

CHAMAN

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

And

2. CWP-18551-2026

DEEPAK AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Bhim Singh, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Priyavrat Parashar, AAG, Haryana

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate with
Ms. Surbhi Rana, Advocate for respondents-HSIIDC

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from **CWP-18550-2026**.



2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to pay interest in accordance with provision of Section 80 of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short '2013 Act').

3. Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate appeared and filed Power of Attorneys on behalf of respondents-HSIIDC. The same are taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

4. The respondent issued notification dated 25.04.2008 under Section 4 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short '1894 Act') for the acquisition of land pertaining to Village Sehrwan, Tehsil Manesar, District Gurugram. The said notification was followed by notification dated 22.04.2009 under Section 6 of 1894 Act. The petitioner's land was acquired. He was paid compensation. He claims that he was not paid interest as per Section 80 of 2013 Act.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Mr. Priyavrat Parashar, AAG, Haryana and Mr. Pritam Singh Saini who on advance notice are present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and waives service.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents submit that issue involved herein especially with respect to same notification issued under Section 4 of 1894 Act, a Division Bench of this Court has already vide judgment dated 10.02.2026 dismissed a bunch of appeals including *LPA-452-2022*.



8. Faced with this, learned counsel for petitioner submits that landowners have approached Hon'ble Supreme Court which has issued notice of motion.

9. On being asked, learned counsel for the petitioner confirmed that Hon'ble Supreme Court has not stayed operation of judgment and order passed by Division Bench of this Court.

10. In the absence of stay granted by Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is bound by judgment of Division Bench of this Court.

11. The petition deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed in terms of judgment passed in *LPA-452-2022*.

12. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

01.07.2026
SDK

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