

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

109

**RFA No.2225 of 2017(O & M)
Date of Decision:31.05.2017**

Om Devi and others

....appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr.K.Arun Singh, Advocate for
Mr.Virender Khatri, Advocate
for the appellants

ARUN PALLI, J. (ORAL):

CM No.5941-CI-2017

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 960 days in re-filing the accompanying appeal.

For the reasons set out in the application, that is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, delay of 960 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.5942-CI-2017

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 04 days in filing the accompanying appeal.

Notice in the application.

On the asking of the Court, Ms.Safia Gupta, AAG Haryana, present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 and Mr.Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.3.

For the reasons set out in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, delay of 04 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.5943-CI-2017

For the reasons set out in the application, that is duly supported by an affidavit, same is allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Consequently, legal representatives of deceased Phoolo-appellant No.4, who is stated to have died on 06.07.2015, as depicted in para No.2 of the application, are brought on record, for the purpose of pursuing the appeal only.

CM stands disposed of.

CM No.5940-CI-2017 and RFA No.2225 of 2017

Learned counsel for the appellants fairly submits that the matter in issue is squarely covered by an order/judgement dated 03.11.2015 rendered by this Court in RFA No.4101 of 2008 titled “HSIDC now Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation versus Rajesh Kumar and others”, vide which, in the appeals arising out of the same acquisition, this Court had enhanced the compensation awarded to the landowners, and, thus, the instant appeal, too has to be disposed in terms thereof.

The factual position as set out above, is not disputed by learned counsel for the respondents.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

That being so, the present appeal is also disposed of in terms of the decision of this Court in the case of Rajesh Kumar and others (supra).

May 31, 2017
neenu

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No.
Whether reportable-	Yes/No