



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

**Civil Writ Petition No. 4522 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.09.2025**

Harpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Rathore, Advocate with
Mr. Satyaveer Singh, Advocate
for respondent No. 2-NHAI.

Mr. Athar Ahmad, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No. 3.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-landowner, by way of present writ petition, seeks setting aside of an order dated 10.11.2020 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No. 3-Sub Divisional Magistrate-cum-Competent Authority for Land Acquisition, Malerkotla, District Sangrur, whereby his objections in terms of Section 3-C of The National Highways Act, 1956 (**for short “1956 Act”**) against the Notification dated 04.02.2020 issued under Section 3-A thereof have been rejected.

[2] Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the declaration of Notification dated 04.02.2020 issued under Section 3-A of Act was published in two newspapers on 22.05.2020 & 28.10.2020; thus, the objections preferred at the instance of petitioner on 10.11.2020 were clearly within 21 days from the date of publication of the notification and as such,

the objections could not have been rejected being barred by limitation.

[3] On the other hand, learned State Counsel submits that Notification under Section 3-A of 1956 Act was issued on 04.02.2020, therefore, the objections were required to be preferred within 21 days thereafter and thus, the same preferred on 10.11.2020 were clearly barred by limitation; hence, the impugned order warrants no interference.

[4] I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book.

[5] A perusal of the record shows that the declaration under Section 3-A of 1956 Act was made through Notification dated 04.02.2020, however, the said declaration was published in two newspapers on 22.05.2020 & 28.10.2020; thus, the objections filed at the instance of petitioners on 10.11.2020 were clearly within 21 days of the publication of the Notification made on 28.10.2020 and accordingly, could not have been dismissed/rejected being barred by limitation. Further, a perusal of the language under Section 3-C of 1956 Act clearly stipulates that the 21 days period for filing of objections starts from the date of publication of the notification and not from its declaration.

[6] In such circumstances, the order dated 10.11.2020 / 29.12.2020 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No. 3 is against the statutory provision and its intent, thus, the same is set aside.

[7] Respondent No. 3 is directed to examine objections preferred at the instance of petitioner on 10.11.2020 afresh after granting him an opportunity of hearing. The petitioner shall accordingly appear before respondent No. 3 on **22nd September, 2025**. The needful be done thereafter within two months from the date of appearance of petitioner before

respondent No. 3.

[8] It is made clear that in case the needful exercise is not done by respondent No. 3 within the aforementioned period, the officer concerned shall be personally liable to pay costs of Rs. 50,000/- to the petitioner towards unnecessary delay in the litigation.

[9] **Disposed off** accordingly.

[10] Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

September 16, 2025

'dk kamra'

(HARKESH MANUJA)

JUDGE

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>