



2026:PHHC:078053

RFA-2921-2015 (O&M)

[1]

2026:PHHC:078053



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

RFA-2921-2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 13.05.2026

Satbir and others

.....Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and ors.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: None for the appellants/ landowners.

Mr. Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana.

-.-

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

By way of present appeal(s), challenge has been laid to the Award dated 24.07.2014 passed by the learned Addl. District Judge, Kaithal (hereinafter to be referred as the '**Reference Court**').

2. Briefly stating, in the present case(s), land measuring 0.37 acres situated within the revenue estate of Village Sanghan, H.B. No. 10, Tehsil and District Kaithal was acquired vide Notifications dated 09.06.2010 (published on 22.06.2010) and 28.12.2010 (published on 04.01.2011) issued under Sections 4 & 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short the '**1894 Act**') respectively for the public purpose, namely, "*for extension of Shergarh Guhna Link Channel*". Award under Section 11 of the 1894 Act was passed



by the Land Acquisition Collector (for short '**the LAC**') on 10.08.2011, thereby determining the market value of the acquired land @ Rs.12,00,000/- per acre besides award of all other statutory benefits and interests provided under the 1894 Act.

3. Dissatisfied with the Award passed by the LAC, appellants/landowners invoked References under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, which came to be partly allowed by the learned Reference Court vide its decision dated 24.07.2014, while enhancing the market value to Rs.18,00,000/- per acre besides awarding all other statutory benefits/interest in their favour under the 1894 Act. Aggrieved thereof, the present appeal was preferred at the instance of appellants-landowners.

CONTENTION(S):

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS-LANDOWNERS:-

4. No one has chosen to appear on behalf of the appellants/landowners.

ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT-STATE:-

5. Learned State counsel submits that the award passed by the learned Reference Court was based upon proper appreciation of the pleadings and the evidence available on record. He further submits that the learned Reference Court awarded market value at the rate of Rs.18,00,000/- per acre in favour of the appellants/landowners, which calls for no interference and, thus prays for dismissal of the appeal(s). No other argument has been raised on



behalf of the respondent/State.

DISCUSSION AND REASONING:-

6. I have heard learned State counsel and gone through the paper-book as well as records of the case.

7. In view of the previous order, learned State counsel has produced a site plan depicting the location of land forming part of all the four revenue estates of Villages, namely, Mal Kheri, Sanghan, Padla and Guhna which are involved in the present acquisition. The said site plan has been signed by Sh. Kartik Makkar, Sub Divisional Officer, Kaithal Water Services Sub Division, Kaithal. Learned State counsel has also counter-signed the same. As the said site plan will assist this Court to decide the appeal(s) in hand in an effective manner as such, the same is taken on record as **Mark 'X'**.

8. A perusal of the record shows that vide common notification dated 09.06.2010 under Section 4 of the 1894 Act followed by a notification dated 28.12.2010 issued under Section 6 thereof, land forming part of four revenue estates of Villages Mal Kheri, Sanghan, Padla and Guhna was acquired for the same public purpose namely, "*for extension of Shergarh Guhna Link Channel*". Vide separate orders, the market value for all the four revenue estates was assessed at the uniform rate of Rs. 12,00,000/- per acre by the LAC.

9. A perusal of the site plan Mark X shows that the boundaries of Village Malkheri and Village Sanghan are abutting and



adjoining to each other. Admittedly, the market value of land in village Mal Kheri, acquired vide the same notification dated 09.06.2010 and for the same public purpose, was re-assessed and enhanced by this Court at Rs.27,87,840/- per acre vide decision dated 28.04.2026 passed in RFA No 207 of 2015, tilted as ***Bije Singh Vs. State of Haryana and ors.***

9.1. Also, considering the fact that the LAC, in its wisdom, assessed an identical market value of Rs. 12,00,000/- per acre for the revenue estates of both village Sangha and village Mal Kheri vide separate awards which clearly indicates that the respondent authorities were conscious of the fact that the acquired land parcels forming part of the above two revenue estates did not suffer from any material variation in terms of their locational advantage, accessibility, and development potential. Such assessment itself reflects that the entire acquired land formed part of a homogeneous tract possessing similar characteristics and potentialities, warranting uniform treatment in the matter of valuation. It would, therefore, be just and fair to determine the market value of the acquired land of village Sangha at the same rate of Rs.27,87,840/- per acre, as assessed by this Court in respect of village Mal Kheri in ***Bije Singh's case*** (supra).

10. Accordingly, the market value of the acquired land is assessed at the rate of **Rs.27,87,840/- per acre** on the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act in case(s) in hand. In addition, the appellants/landowners shall also be entitled to all other

**RFA-2921-2015 (O&M)**

[5]

statutory benefits and interest under the 1894 Act, especially solatium and interest thereupon.

11. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, the present appeal preferred at the instance of landowners is partly allowed with the aforesaid modification.

12. Further, wherever, the landowner(s) has/have unfortunately expired in the appeal(s)/ cross-objection(s) after filing thereof and the legal heirs have not been impleaded, they shall be at liberty to seek execution of the present decision by moving appropriate application(s) before the learned Executing Court.

13. Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

13.05.2026
sanjay

(**HARKESH MANUJA**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether Reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No