

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
CIVIL APPEAL NO.787 OF 2011

CHAND RAM . . . APPELLANT (S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS. . . RESPONDENT (S)

O R D E R

1. This appeal is directed against the judgment and order, passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in C.W.P. No. 4413 of 2006, dated 13.07.2006, whereby and whereunder the High Court has dismissed the said writ petition in terms of the decision of the High Court, passed in C.W.P. No. 4300 of 2006, dated 25.05.2006.

2. The facts, in brief, are: The State of Haryana issued a notification under Section 4 of the Act, 1894, dated 17.11.2005, by which it

sought acquire land spread over a few villages for the public purpose of development and utilization of land for residential, commercial and institutional sectors 65, 66, 67 and 68, Sonapat. After hearing the objections filed under Section 5-A of the Act, 1894, the State issued a declaration, under Section 6 of the Act, 1894, dated 07.02.2006, for the acquisition of the land in question.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellants herein, had invoked the writ jurisdiction of the High Court questioning, *inter alia*, the process of acquisition resorted to by the respondent State herein. By the impugned judgment and order, the High Court has dismissed the writ petition and upheld the notifications issued under Section 4 and Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, "the Act, 1894").

4. Aggrieved by the judgment and order so passed by the High Court, the appellant is before us in this appeal.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties to the *lis* and carefully perused the records of the case.

6. We do not see any good ground to interfere with the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court. Accordingly, this civil appeal is dismissed.

7. However, we grant liberty to the appellant herein, if he so desires, to make an appropriate application, as provided under Section 48 of the Act, 1894, before the appropriate authority/forum within one month from today.

8. If such an application is made within one months' time from today, we request the appropriate authority/forum to consider the same in accordance with law.

9. Interim order passed by this Court shall continue to the benefit of the appellant till the aforementioned application is decided by the authorities concerned.

Ordered accordingly.

.....CJI.  
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.  
(A.K. SIKRI)

.....J.  
(ARUN MISHRA)

NEW DELHI  
FEBRUARY 24, 2015.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.880 OF 2011

M/S. BALAJI SPUNTEX PVT. LTD.& . . .APPELLANT(S)  
ANR.

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS. . . .RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NO.882 OF 2011

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO.1310 OF 2011

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO.23519-23520 OF 2013

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO.35996 OF 2013

O R D E R

1. Delay, in filing and refiling the special leave petition(s), if any, is condoned.
2. Delay in filing the application(s) for substitution, if any, is condoned.
3. Application(s) for substitution, if any, is/are allowed.

4. Application(s) for impleadment, if any, is/are rejected.

5. These appeals and special leave petitions are directed against the judgment and order, passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in C.W.P. No.3614 of 2008, dated 22.01.2008, whereby and whereunder the High Court has dismissed the said writ petition in terms of the decision of the High Court, passed in C.W.P. No.2835 of 2006, dated 22.01.2008.

6. The facts, in brief, are: The State of Haryana issued a notification under Section 4 of the Act, 1894, dated 17.11.2005, by which it sought acquire land spread over a few villages for the public purpose of development and utilization of land for residential, commercial and institutional sectors 65, 66, 67 and 68, Sonapat.

After hearing the objections filed under Section 5-A of the Act, 1894, the State issued a declaration, under Section 6 of the Act, 1894, dated 07.02.2006, for the acquisition of the land in question.

7. Being aggrieved, the appellants/petitioners herein, had invoked the writ jurisdiction of the High Court questioning, *inter alia*, the acquisition process. By the impugned judgment and order, the High Court has dismissed the writ petition and following its decision in C.W.P. No.4300 of 2006, dated 25.05.2006, upheld the acquisition of the land in question.

8. Aggrieved by the judgment and order so passed by the High Court, the appellants/petitioners are before us in these appeals and special leave petitions.

9. We have heard learned counsel for the parties to the *lis* and carefully perused the records of the case.

10. We do not see any good ground to interfere with the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court. Accordingly, these civil appeals and special leave petitions are dismissed.

11. However, we grant liberty to the appellants and petitioners herein, if they so desire, to make appropriate application(s) as provided under Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, before the appropriate authority/forum within one month from today.

12. If such an application(s) is/are made within one months' time from today, we request the

appropriate authority/forum to consider the same in accordance with law.

13. Interim order passed by this Court shall continue to the benefit of the appellants/petitioners till the application(s) is/are decided by the authorities concerned.

Ordered accordingly.

.....CJI.  
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.  
(A.K. SIKRI)

.....J.  
(ARUN MISHRA)

NEW DELHI  
FEBRUARY 24, 2015.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SEPCIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO.6285 OF 2011

RAVINDER PAL SINGH . . . PETITIONER (S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR. . . RESPONDENT (S)

O R D E R

1. Shri Jasbir Singh Malik, learned counsel for the petitioner, would state that he has already filed a writ petition before the High Court, *inter alia*, bringing to the notice of the Court that he is entitled to the benefit of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

2. In view of the above, learned counsel seeks permission of this Court to withdraw this special leave petition.

3. The permission sought for is granted.

4. The special leave petition is accordingly disposed of as withdrawn.

5. We request the High Court to dispose of the writ petition filed by the petitioner pending before it as expeditiously as possible.

Ordered accordingly.

.....CJI.  
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.  
(A.K. SIKRI)

.....J.  
(ARUN MISHRA)

NEW DELHI  
FEBRUARY 24, 2015.

ITEM NO.5

COURT NO.1

SECTION IV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No(s). 787/2011

CHAND RAM

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(with office report)

WITH

C.A. No. 791/2011

(With Interim Relief and Office Report)

C.A. No. 880/2011

(With appln.(s) for directions and Office Report)

C.A. No. 882/2011

(With appln.(s) for directions and Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 1310/2011

(With Interim Relief and Office Report)

C.A. No. 1379/2011

(With appln.(s) for directions and Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 6285/2011

(With Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 23519-23520/2013

(With appln.(s) for substitution and appln.(s) for permission to file additional documents and Interim Relief and Office Report)

SLP(C) No. 35996/2013

(With Interim Relief and Office Report)

Date : 24/02/2015 These matters were called  
on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRA

For Appellant(s)/  
Petitioner(s)

Mr. Rishi Malhotra, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Mitra, Adv.

Mr. Saurabh Seth, Adv.

Ms. Sonia Dube, Adv.

Ms. Deepali Dwivedi, Adv.

Mr. S. Chakraborty, Adv.

For Mr. Yash Pal Dhingra, Adv.

Mr. Satinder S. Gulati, Adv.

Mrs. Kamaldeep Gulati, Adv.

Dr. Kailash Chand, Adv.

Mr. Jasbir Singh Malik, Adv.

Mr. S. K. Sabharwal, Adv.

Mr. Yash Anand, Adv.

Mr. David A., Adv.

Mr. Yash Shinghal, Adv.

Mr. Rabin Majumder, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Ms. Nidhi Gupta, AAG

Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Govind Goel, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Ankit Goel, Adv.

Mr. Mohan Lal Sharma, Adv.

Dr. Kailash Chand, Adv.

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

C.A.No.787/2011

Civil appeal is dismissed in terms of  
the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, stand  
disposed of.

C.A. No.880/2011, 882/2011, 1310/2011  
SLP(C)No.23519-23520/2013, 35996/2013

Delay in filing and refiling the special  
leave petition(s), if any, is condoned.

Delay in filing the application(s) for  
substitution, if any, is condoned.

Application(s) for substitution, if any,  
is/are allowed.

Application(s) for impleadment, if any,  
is/are rejected.

The civil appeals and special leave  
petitions are dismissed in terms of the signed  
order.

Pending application(s), if any, stand  
disposed of.

C.A.Nos.791/2011, 1379/2011

De-tag these appeals from this batch of matter and be listed separately.

SLP(C)No.6285/2011

The special leave petition is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

(Neetu Khajuria)  
Sr.P.A.

(Vinod Kulvi)  
Assistant Registrar

(Three signed orders are placed on the file.)