

2026.PHHC.032124



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

CR-6786-2019 (O&M)
Decided on:-26.02.2026

Union of India and anotherPetitioners.

VS.

Mukhtiar Singh and anotherRespondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Kanwar, Senior Panel Counsel,
for UOI-petitioners.

Mr. R.S. Manhas, Advocate for the respondents.

Mr. Puru Jarewal, DAG, Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. Vide this common judgment, a batch of total 14 connected civil revision petitions is being decided as all have arisen out of a common issue. The details of the connected cases are given at the bottom of the judgment.

1.2 For convenience, the facts are being taken from CR-6786-2019 (O&M).

2. By way of present revision petition, challenge has been laid to an order dated 26.02.2019 passed by the learned District Judge-cum-Executing Court, Pathankot, which is reproduced hereunder:-

"Mukhtiar Singh vs. UOI

*Present; Shri Ravinder Singh Thakur, Advocate for decree holder
Shri Rajdeep Singh Advocate, for JD*

Present execution application is pending since 26.10.2017. Power of attorney was filed on 12.12.2017. An application was moved by Defence Estate Officer in the present execution application which was disposed of on

merits. Even S.C. Kaushik Principal Director appeared in person and so far made the payment of 30% of the enhanced amount along-with interest on solatium but the amount is claimed decree holder is deficient as the date from which the amount is liable to be deposited is the date when the notification is made but the amount is deposited from the date of taking of possession without interest on the increase of the enhanced amount with all statutory benefits. In the connected matter titled as Major Paritam Singh v. UOI, the SLP is filed. As the applicant are not party in that SLP filed by Pritam Singh. There is no impediment for making full remaining payment along-with interest on solatium. Therefore, the property of the JD is ordered to be attached on filing of list of property. Meanwhile, calculation sheet be filed. Connected matter is fixed for 18.03.2019. therefore, the case is adjourned to 18.03.2019.

*Rakesh Kumar Sharma
Additional District Judge
Pathankot
UID013*

Dated: 26.02.2019”

3. Briefly stating, vide notification dated 22.02.1991 (published on 06.03.1991), issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (**for short, “1894 Act”**), land in 10 revenue estates of the then District Gurdaspur, was acquired for the public purpose namely, “*defence purpose*”. Award under Section 11 of the 1894 Act was passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as “LAC”) on 15.03.1993. Aggrieved of the said award, reference petition(s) under Section 18 of the 1894 Act were preferred at the instance of landowners, which were decided vide various decisions of different dates by the learned Reference Court whereby compensation was enhanced in favour of landowners. Later, this Court vide decision dated 17.02.2016 passed in RFA-2902-1999, re-assessed the market value for all the said references @ Rs.2300/- per marla. In the year 2017, execution applications were preferred at the instance of respondents-landowners, wherein, 30% of the enhanced amount was deposited by the petitioners-judgment debtor. During proceedings, vide the impugned order dated 26.02.2019, the learned Executing Court directed the

petitioners to deposit the remaining amount along with interest, solatium as well as interest on solatium. Aggrieved thereof, the present revision petitions came to be preferred by the Union of India.

4. On 07.11.2019, this Court passed the following order in the revision petitions:-

“Learned senior counsel for the petitioners has referred to order dated 26.02.2019 (P-6) which clarifies that the SLP filed by the land owners against the judgment passed by this Court on 17.02.2016 was dismissed on 26.04.2017 vide Civil Appeal No. 5723-2017 titled as Anchal Singh and others vs. Union of India and others.

The SLP filed by the land owner has been dismissed and the with respect to appeal filed by the Union of India, leave is already granted as per Annexure P-1. Thus the claimants are not entitled for release of enhanced compensation as ordered by the Executing Court.

Notice of motion for 21.11.2019.

To be heard along with C.R. No. 5744-2018.

In the meantime, operation of impugned order dated 26.02.2019 (P-6) shall remain stayed.

Further, Union of India is restrained from depositing balance 70% amount as ordered by the Executing Court.”

5. At this stage, it has not been disputed by both the respective counsel that the Civil Appeal No.23521 of 2017 preferred at the instance of Union of India, stands dismissed by the Hon’ble Apex Court vide order dated 23.02.2023, followed by dismissal of similar appeals (Diary No(s).39125/2023, Diary No(s). 43254/2024, Diary No(s).43253-2024 and Diary No(s), 24953-2025) vide decision dated 04.08.2025. Even some of the review applications preferred by the petitioners herein also stand dismissed by the Hon’ble Apex Court. The relevant portion of order dated 04.08.2025 is extracted hereunder:-

“The issue involved in all these petitions is covered by the decision of this Court in C.A. No.23521/2017 passed on 23.02.2023. We have

been informed that the review against the same has also been dismissed.
In such view of the matter, the Special Leave Petitions are
dismissed.
Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

6. In such circumstances, the adjudication made by this Court on 17.02.2016 in RFA-2902-1999, having attained finality, the petitioners are legally bound to comply with the same and disburse the requisite compensation amount in favour of the respondents-landowners.
7. As such, in view of the above mentioned subsequent development, no interference is called for with the impugned order dated 26.02.2019. Accordingly, the present petitions preferred at the instance of Union of India being devoid of any merit, are hereby dismissed.
8. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

26.02.2026
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: Yes

Sr. No.	Case No.
1	CR-6307-2018 (O&M)
2.	CR-6312-2018 (O&M)
3	CR-6313-2018 (O&M)
4	CR-7148-2019 (O&M)
5	CR-7149-2019 (O&M)
6	CR-7157-2019 (O&M)
7	CR-7163-2019 (O&M)
8	CR-7170-2019 (O&M)
9	CR-7172-2019 (O&M)
10	CR-7173-2019 (O&M)
11	CR-7175-2019 (O&M)
12	CR-7418-2019 (O&M)
13	CR-2051-2020 (O&M)

26.02.2026
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE