

(2013) 11 P&H CK 0130

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Regular First Appeal No. 2878 of 2008 (O and M)

Sardar Singh and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 21-11-2013

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2013) 11 P&H CK 0130

Hon'ble Judges : Rajesh Bindal, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Gaurav Singla, for Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, for the Appellant; Kunal Garg, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Disposed Off

Judgement

Rajesh Bindal, J.—The landowners are in appeal before this court against the award of the learned court below passed u/s 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, "the Act") seeking enhancement of compensation for the acquired land. Briefly, the facts of the case are that the State of Haryana vide notification dated 23.7.2002, issued u/s 4 of the Act, sought to acquire land falling in the revenue estates of villages Ottu, Chak Sahiba, Moujdin, Madho Singhana and Mallekan, Tehsil and District Sirsa for construction of Kasawa Minor from RD 0 to 40200. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short, "the Collector") vide award dated 11.3.2003 assessed the market value of the acquired land. The land owners feeling dissatisfied with the award of the Collector, filed objections. On reference u/s 18 of the Act, the learned court determined the compensation of the acquired land vide award dated 25.4.2007. It is the award of the learned court below which is impugned in the present appeal by the landowners.

2. Learned counsels for the appellants submitted that the claim of the appellants in the present appeal is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in RFA No. 3831 of 2007-Hardev Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and another decided on 14.9.2010, whereby the compensation payable for the acquired land of village Madhosinghana was determined @ Rs. 3,84,400/- per acre, for the

acquired land of village Ottu @ Rs. 4,96,000/-per acre and award in respect of other villages namely Chak Sahiba, Moujdin and Mallekan, was upheld.

3. Learned counsel for the State did not dispute the aforesaid factual position. Accordingly, for the reasons mentioned in Hardev Singh's case (supra), the appeal is disposed of in the same terms.