

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.885 OF 2011

RAJBIR SINGH(D) THR. LRS. & ORS.

... APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

...RESPONDENT(S)

W I T H

CIVIL APPEAL NO.889 OF 2011

CIVIL APPEAL NO.671 OF 2012

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 25510 OF 2010

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 1088 OF 2011

AND WITH

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 3207 OF 2011

O R D E R

1. Delay, in filing and refiling the special leave petition(s)/appeal(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,

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
NEETU KHAJURIA
Date: 2015.07.10
17:20:55 IST
Reason:

is/are allowed.

2

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

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 judgment(s) and order(s) passed by the High Court. Accordingly, these appeals and special leave

petitions are dismissed.

7. However, we grant liberty to the appellants and petitioners, 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.

8. 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.

3

9. Interim order passed by this Court shall continue to the benefit of the appellants/petitioners till the aforesaid 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.

1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2650 OF 2015
(Arising out of SLP(C)No.4993 of 2010)

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

...APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.

2. 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. 3972 of 2008, dated 07.01.2009.

3. The respondents, though served, are unrepresented before us. We have heard learned counsel for the appellants and carefully perused the records of the case.

4. In view of the order passed by this Court in Civil Appeal No. 286 of 2012, titled "State of Haryana & Ors. vs. Hari Chand & Ors.", dated 10.12.2013, the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court is set aside and the matter is remanded to the High Court for fresh disposal in accordance with law.

5. Accordingly, the civil appeal is disposed of.

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

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

.....J.
(ARUN MISHRA)

NEW DELHI
FEBRUARY 24, 2015.

BASIR AHMED & ORS.

...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 C.W.P. No. 18338 of 2009, dated 04.08.2010.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the parties to the lis and carefully perused the records.

3. After arguing for some time, Shri P.H. Parekh, learned senior counsel for the appellants, on instructions, seeks permission of this Court to withdraw this civil appeal with liberty to file a fresh representation before the appropriate authority/forum seeking benefit of policy dated 26.10.2007.

2

4. The permission sought for is granted. The Civil Appeal is disposed of as withdrawn.

5. The learned senior counsel for the appellants is permitted to file a fresh representation before the appropriate authority/forum within a month's time seeking benefit of the policy dated 26.10.2007. If such an application is made, the same shall be considered and disposed of by the appropriate authority/forum in accordance with law.

6. We clarify that we have not expressed any opinion one way or the other insofar as benefit of policy dated 26.10.2007 is concerned, and the same shall be decided on its own merits in accordance with law.

Ordered accordingly.

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

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

.....J.
(ARUN MISHRA)

NEW DELHI
FEBRUARY 24, 2015.

1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.314 OF 2012

RITU OBROI & ORS.

...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.18058 of 2006, dated 03.10.2008, whereby and whereunder the High Court, finding no merit in the said writ petition, dismissed the same.

2. The facts, in brief, are: the State of Haryana issued a notification under Section 4 of the Act, 1894 (for short, "the Act, 1894"), dated 30.05.2005, by which it sought acquire land situated

2

in village Jagadhari for the public purpose of development and utilization of land for residential and commercial purposes. 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 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 notifications issued under Section 4 and Section 6 of the Act, 1894 and the rejection of release of the appellant's land under a given policy of the respondent State.

4. The High Court duly considered all the contentions put forth by petitioner therein and found no merit in the same. Further, the High Court concluded that the order of the Director, dated 14.05.2008, rejecting the representation of the appellant herein for release of the land in question, is wholly justified. Therefore, by the impugned judgment and order, the High Court has dismissed the writ petition of the appellant herein on merits.

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

6. We have heard learned counsel for the parties to the lis and carefully perused the records.

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

Ordered accordingly.

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. Satyapal Khushal Chand Pasi, Adv.
Mr. T.R. Pasi, Adv.

Ms. Nupur Choudhary, Adv.
For Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Jasbir Singh Malik, Adv.
Mr. S. K. Sabharwal, Adv.

Mr. Subramonium Prasad, Adv.
Mr. Vijay Nair, Adv.
Mr. Manoranjan Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Shubhra Pathak, Adv.

Mr. V. Giri, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Abhijat P. Medh, Adv.

Mr. Satinder S. Gulati, Adv.
Mrs. Kamaldeep Gulati, 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.

Md. Shahid Anwar, Adv.

Mr. Punit Dutt Tyagi, Adv.

Mr. Manoj Swarup, Adv.
Mr. Ankit Swarup, Adv.
Ms. Tanya Swarup, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Ms. Nupur Choudhary, Adv.
For Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Naresh Bakshi, Adv.

Dr. Monika Gusain, Adv.

3

Mr. Ravindra Bana, Adv.

Mr. D.N. Goburdhan, Adv.
Mr. Prabal Bagchi, Adv.

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

C.A. No. 829/2011

This civil appeal is de-tagged from this batch of matters
and be listed next week for hearing.

C.A. Nos. 885/2011, 889/2011, 671/2012, SLP(C) Nos.
25510/2010, 1088/2011 and 3207/2011

Delay, in filing and refiling the special leave petition(s)/appeal(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.

Civil Appeal No.2650/2015 @ SLP(C) No. 4993/2010

Leave granted.

The civil appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

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

4

SLP(C) No. 27743/2010

Heard learned counsel for the parties to the lis.

We do not see any good ground to interfere with the judgment and order passed by the High Court. Accordingly, the special leave petition is dismissed.

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

SLP(C) No. 31147/2010

After arguing the matter for quite some time, Shri V.

Giri, learned senior counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, seeks permission of this Court to withdraw this special leave petition with liberty to file review petition before the High Court.

Permission sought for is granted.

The special leave petition is disposed of as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to file review petition before the High Court within one month from today. If such a petition is filed made within one month's time from today, we request the High Court to consider the same in accordance with

law.

We clarify that we have not expressed any opinion on the writ petition.

C.A. No. 2897/2011

The civil appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

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

5

C.A. No. 314/2012

The civil appeal is dismissed in terms of the signed order.

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

(Neetu Khajuria)
Sr.P.A.

(Vinod Kulvi)
Assistant Registrar

(Four signed orders are placed on the file.)