

2026:PHHC:089854



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

CR-4941-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision : 03.07.2026

Union of India and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

Ved Parkash Aggarwal and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Dharm Chand Mittal, Senior Panel Counsel,
for petitioners-UI.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Article 227 of Constitution of India are seeking setting aside of orders dated 02.01.2026, 28.01.2026 and 31.01.2026 whereby learned Additional District Judge, Hisar has directed them to make payment of ₹3,43,803/- and issued warrant of attachment.

2. Land measuring 1944 Kanal 03 Marlas was acquired vide notification dated 18.06.1984 issued under Section 4 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short '1894 Act') followed by notification dated 25.06.1984 issued under Section 6 of 1894 Act. LAC, Hisar vide Award dated 22.01.1986 awarded compensation to land owners. They preferred reference petition under Section 18 of 1894 Act. Learned Additional District Judge, Hisar vide Award dated 24.04.1989 enhanced the compensation. Thereafter, both parties preferred RFAs before this Court which were disposed of vide common order dated 19.04.1996 and compensation was granted at uniform rate of ₹1,05,000/- per acre. Both the parties filed intra Court appeals and this Court vide order

dated 07.07.2025 disposed of the appeals. The respondent-land owners filed execution applications. Learned Additional District Judge, Hisar in Execution Application No. EXE/1483/2018 vide order dated 02.01.2026 has directed payment of ₹3,43,803/- and vide order dated 28.01.2026 issued warrant of attachment

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that actual liability of petitioners comes to ₹2,77,143/-. The respondent-decree holder is wrongly claiming recovery of ₹3,43,803/-.

4. This Court at this stage does not find it appropriate to dwell into calculations made by both sides. There is minor difference between the amount claimed by decree holder and accepted by the petitioners-judgment debtors. It would be appropriate for the Executing Court to consider calculations submitted by both the sides and pass an appropriate order. Ordered accordingly.

5. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

July, 03, 2026
Ajay Prasher

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

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