

:

1

ITEM NO.14

COURT NO.4

SECTION IVB

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil)...../2011
CC 8681-8683/2011

(From the judgement and order dated 11/03/2011 in RA Nos.78/2011,
74/2011 and 76/2011 and final judgement and order dated 15.12.2010
in CWP Nos.17723/2007, 18458/2007 and 43/2008 of the HIGH COURT OF
PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH)

HARJIT SINGH ETC. ETC.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and office report)

WITH S.L.P.(C)...CC NO. 9494 of 2011

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and office report)

Date: 27/05/2011 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S. SINGHVI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD
[VACATION BENCH]

For Petitioner(s) Mr. G.S. Grewal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Harjat Singh Bedi, Adv.
Mr. P.N. Puri, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Rajesh Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Shalu Sharma, AOR (Not present)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Delay condoned.

These petitions are directed against orders dated

2

15.12.2010, 11.3.2011 and 6.5.2011 passed by the Division
Bench of the Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP
Nos.17723/2007, 18458/2007, 18281/2007, 43/2008 and
Review Application Nos.78/2011, 74/2011, 76/2011 and
106/2011 (O&M).

We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners
and counsel representing Gurdaspur Improvement Trust, who
has appeared on caveat and perused the record.

In our view, the reasons assigned by the High
Court for refusing to interfere with the acquisition of
the petitioners' land under the Punjab Town Improvement
Act, 1922 are legally correct. The High Court rightly
relied upon the judgments of this Court in Teja Singh vs.
State of Punjab (1995) 4 SCC 540 and Shantiji Patel vs.
State of Maharashtra (2006) 2 SCC 505 for negating the
petitioners' challenge on the ground that notice had not

been served upon all those whose names were entered in the revenue records and that the acquisition under the Punjab Town Improvement Act was not contrary to the provisions contained in Articles 243-G, 243-N, 243-Q, 243-ZD and 243-ZF of the Constitution. The High Court also did not commit any error by dismissing the review applications filed by the petitioners because the main order was not vitiated by any error apparent on the face of the record.

The special leave petitions are accordingly dismissed.

However, two months' further time is allowed to the petitioners to file applications under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act. If such applications are filed, the Collector shall make reference by treating the

3

applications to be within limitation.

The Land Acquisition Tribunal is directed to dispose of all the pending references in connection with the disputed acquisition within a maximum period of six months from the date of production of a copy of this order.

(Ravi P. Verma)
Court Master

(Phoolan Wati Arora)
Court Master