



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

114

CWP No.18913 of 2026

Date of decision: July 1st, 2026

Vipin Tyagi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Ms. Arzoo Modi and Mr. Sandeep Siwach, Advocates
for the petitioner.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. On a pointed query raised by this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is not the original owner but has acquired the property subsequent to the notification dated 31.12.2013. It is submitted that since the details of the said ownership have not been mentioned in the present petition, thus, the present petition be disposed of but liberty be granted to the petitioner to revive the same after annexing the documents to show the date on which the petitioner had purchased the property in question. The petitioner would also address on the aspect as to whether the subsequent purchaser, after the notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 is entitled to challenge the acquisition in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Shiv Kumar and another Versus Union of India and others* reported as **2019 (10) SCC 229** and in the case of *V. Chandrasekaran and another Versus Administrative Officer and others* reported as **2012 (12) SCC 133**.

2. Disposed of with aforesaid liberty.

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

July 1st, 2026

Puneet

**(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No