

2026:PHHC:054819



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

Decided on:-08.04.2026

1. RFA-3678-2016 (O&M)

Ishwar Singh

.Appellant.

vs.

State of Haryana and others

.Respondents.

2. RFA-4319-2016 (O&M)

Ramgopal

.Appellant.

vs.

State of Haryana and others

.Respondents.

3. RFA-3454-2016 (O&M)

Chand Ram

.Appellant.

vs.

State of Haryana and others

.Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate,
for the appellant(s)-landowner(s).

Mr. Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. This common judgment shall dispose of the aforementioned three connected Regular First Appeals, as all have arisen out of the same award.

1.1 For convenience, the facts are being taken from ***RFA-3678-***

2016 (O&M).

2. By way of present appeal(s), challenge has been laid to an Award dated 20.01.2016 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak, whereby the reference petition(s) preferred at the instance of appellant(s)-landowner(s), were partly accepted.

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the appellant(s) submits that the present appeals are squarely covered by a decision dated 18.02.2026 passed by this Court in a bunch of appeals, lead case of which was ***RFA-2320-2016***, titled as ***“Ram Kishan Suhag vs. State of Haryana and others”***, whereby, the market value of the acquired land situated in the same revenue estate of Village Sunaria Kalan, Tehsil and District Rohtak, was re-assessed @ Rs.56,49,560.00 per acre. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced hereunder:-

“In view of the aforesaid discussion, impugned award dated 20.01.2016 passed by the learned Reference Court is modified and the appellants-landowners are held entitled for award of market value at the rate of Rs. 56,49,560.00 per acre. The appellant(s)-landowner(s) are also awarded consequential / statutory benefits and interest as provided in the 1894 Act (as amended up-to-date), especially the interest on solatium as well.”

4 On the other hand, learned counsel representing the respondents is not in a position to controvert the above factual position.

5. After going through the judgment passed in ***Ram Kishan Suhag ’s case (supra)*** as well as the present case(s), this Court agrees with the assertion of the learned counsel for the appellants.

6. Consequently, the present appeals are disposed of in the same

terms as ***Ram Kishan Suhag's case (supra)*** and the appellants are held entitled for similar amount of compensation @ Rs.56,49,560.00 per acre as has been awarded to other similarly situated landowners along with all statutory benefits and interest available under the amended provisions of 1894 Act as applicable to the present acquisition including the interest on solatium.

7. Pending application, if any, also stand disposed of.

08.04.2026
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

(i) Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
(ii) Whether reportable: Yes/ No