

2025:PHHC:141580



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

**RFA-314-2025 (O&M)  
Decided on:-13.10.2025**

Shrikishan

....Appellant..

vs.

State of Haryana thr. Collector Rohtak  
and others

....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate with  
Mr. Deepak Singh Saini, Advocate and  
Ms. Vamika Johar, Advocate,  
for respondents No.3 & 4.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)**

**CM-705-CI-2025**

1. This is an application for condoning the delay of 2863 days in filing the appeal.
2. Reply to the application filed on behalf of respondents No.3 &4 in the Registry, is taken on record.
  - 2.1 Learned counsel for respondents No.3 and 4 vehemently opposes the prayer made in the application and prays for dismissal of the application.
3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the contents of the application.
4. Concededly, the other similarly situated land owners pertaining to the same acquisition proceedings have already been held entitled for the

enhanced amount of compensation vide judgment dated 02.12.2021 passed by this Court in a bunch of appeals with lead case bearing RFA-3240-2015 (O&M), titled as “**Satpal vs. State of Haryana and another**”.

5. Based thereupon, besides applying the principle of parity, the land owner/applicant being similarly situated, is entitled for grant of similar amount of compensation, however, without any payment of interest for the period he failed to approach this Court after the decision in the reference Court. In this regard reliance can be placed upon the decision of Hon’ble Supreme Court in case of **Ningappa Thotappa Angadi (Dead) through LRs Vs. Special Land Acquisition Officer and Another, 2020 (19) SCC 599**.

6. In view of the discussion made hereinabove, the application is allowed and delay of 2863 days in filing the appeal is hereby condoned.

**RFA-314-2025 (O&M)**

1. Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the matter in issue is squarely covered by the decision rendered by this Court in **Satpal’s** case (supra), decided on 02.12.2021, wherein also the land situated in the same revenue estate of Village Kharawar, Tehsil Sampla, District Rohtak, was acquired vide notifications dated 13.02.2008 and 31.12.2008, issued under Sections 4 & 6 respectively of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, and for the same purpose i.e. for setting up of the Industrial Model Townhsip, Rohtak. Relevant para of **Satpal’s** case (supra) is reproduced hereunder:-

“.....Hence, the market value is assessed at Rs.46,43,116/-per acre (rounded off to the nearest rupee) for the land located upto the depth of 1 acre on the National Highway and at Rs.41,27,214/- per acre (rounded off to the nearest rupee) for the land located in the interior....”

2. Accordingly, the present appeal is disposed of in terms of the said decision and the appellant is held entitled for similar market value along

with all statutory benefits and interest available under the provisions of amended Land Acquisition Act, 1984. However, the appellant shall not be entitled to interest on the enhanced compensation for the period of delay in filing the appeal i.e. 2863 days.

3. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

13.10.2025

sonika

Whether speaking/reasoned:  
Whether reportable:

Yes/No  
Yes/ No

**(HARKESH MANUJA)**  
**JUDGE**