



2026:PHHC:073955



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

**CR-3197-2023 (O&M)
Decided on:-11.05.2026**

Kamlesh @ Kamla

....Petitioner(s).

VS.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Ms. Bhumika Khatri, Advocate for
Mr. Ram Darshan Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhinav Kalia, DAG, Haryana.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present revision petition, challenge has been laid to an order dated 24.08.2022 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Jhajjar, vide which, an application preferred under Section 28A(3) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, at the instance of petitioner-landowner, was dismissed.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book.

3. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the learned Court below specifically recorded that the application filed under Section 28-A(3)



of the 1894 Act did not disclose the requisite pleadings necessary for adjudication of the matter. Neither the grounds seeking re-determination of the compensation amount have been pleaded nor anything has been pleaded or averred as to on what grounds the petitioner sought to challenge the order passed by LAC on the application moved under Section 28(A) of the 1894 Act. It was further observed that in the absence of the requisite pleadings, the Court was unable to frame issues for effective adjudication of the matter.

4. Apparently, an application under Section 28-A(3) of the 1894 Act necessarily requires disclosure of material particulars forming the basis of the claim for re-determination of compensation. In the absence of essential pleadings and supporting material, the Court would be unable to examine either the maintainability or merits of such claim. The impugned order, therefore, cannot be said to suffer from any jurisdictional error, illegality or material irregularity warranting interference in exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. It is also pertinent to mention here that while dismissing the application, liberty was granted to the petitioner-landowner to avail appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

5. Consequently, finding no merit in the present revision petition, the same is dismissed. However, the petitioner-landowner shall be at liberty to file fresh application with better particulars.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

11.05.2026

sonika

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE



CR-3197-2023 (O&M)

--3-- 2026:PHHC:073955

Whether reportable:

Yes/No