

2026:PHHC:033998



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

RFA-227-2023 (O&M)

Decided on:-05.03.2026

Ajit Singh and others

....Appellants.

vs.

Executive Engineer, PWD B&R and others

.Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr.D.K. Tuteja, Advocate for the appellants (thr. V.C.).

Mr. Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

CM-1199-CI-2026

This is an application for preponing the date of hearing in the main appeal and also to dispose of the same in terms of the judgment dated 12.09.2025 (Annexure A-1).

Notice of the application.

Mr. Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and raises no objection to the prayer made in the application.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the contents of the application, prayer made herein is allowed and the date of hearing of the main appeal is preponed from 19.03.2026 to today itself i.e. 05.03.2026 for hearing.

Main case

1. At the outset, learned counsel for the appellants submits that the

present appeal is squarely covered by the decision dated 12.09.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by this Court in a bunch of appeals, lead case of which was ***RFA-33 of 2023 (O&M)***, titled as ***“Om Parkash and others vs. Executive Engineer, PWD B&R, Division No.1, Rohtak and others”*** whereby, the market value of the acquired land was re-assessed at the rate of Rs.78,40,000/-. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced hereunder:-

“However, considering the fact that the land forming part of the sale exemplar Ex.P-6 is situated on the road Rohtak -Bhiwani, whereas, the acquired land is situated 5 -10 acres away from the said Rohtak-Bhiwani road, as such an appropriate cut of 1/3rd needs to be applied. Accordingly, the market value of the acquired land as on 22.12.2013 i.e. on the date of notification 4 of the 1894 Act, thus, comes to Rs.78,40,000/-. In addition, the landowners shall also be entitled for other statutory benefits and interest provided under the 2013 Act.”

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

3. After going through the judgment passed in ***Om Parkash and other’s case (supra)*** as well as the present case, this Court agrees with the assertion of the learned counsel for the appellants.

4. Consequently, the present appeal is disposed of in the same terms as ***Om Parkash and other’s case (supra)***.

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

05.03.2026
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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