

2025:PHHC:131693



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

**RFA-2549-2002 (O&M)**  
**Decided on:-19.09.2025**

Naurang Singh and others

....Appellants..

versus

State of Punjab thr. Collector, Land Acquisition,  
SYL Patiala and another

.Respondents..

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

Present: Mr. Naresh Kaushal, Advocate with  
Mr. Nitish Kaushal, Advocate,  
for the appellants.

Mr. Athar Ahmed, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)**

1. Vide this common judgment, a batch of total 07 connected Regular First Appeals are being decided as all have arisen out of the same award. The details of the connected cases are given on the foot of the judgment.

1.2 For convenience, the facts are being taken from ***RFA-2549-2002 (O&M)***.

2. By way of present appeal, challenge has been laid to an award dated 09.09.1997 passed by the Court of learned Additional District Judge, Rupnagar, whereby, petition under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as '***1894 Act***') filed at the instance of

appellants-landowners, seeking enhancement of compensation was partly allowed.

3. Brief facts of the case are that some land owned by the appellants-landowners, situated in the revenue estate of Village Chaklan, Tehsil and District Ropar was acquired vide notifications dated 28.03.1988 and 22.04.1988, issued under Sections 4 & 6, respectively of the 1894 Act, for the public purpose, namely, construction of Kishanpura Right Distributory. The Land Acquisition Collector vide its award dated 10.05.1989 assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.20,000/- per acre for chahi land, Rs.19,000/- per acre of barani land and Rs.17,000/- per acre for gair mumkin land.

4. Aggrieved of the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector, the appellants-landowners along with others invoked separate reference petition(s) under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, seeking enhancement of compensation. Upon consideration of the material available on record as well as the settlement arrived at between the members of the Action Committee, the Reference Court vide its award dated 09.09.1997, enhanced the market value @ Rs.1 lacs per acre for chahi land and Rs.80,000/-per acre for barani land besides granting all other statutory benefits including interest and solatium etc.

5. Feeling aggrieved of the aforesaid award passed by the Reference Court, the appellants-landowners preferred the aforementioned appeals, praying for further enhancement towards market value and other benefits.

6. Impugning the aforementioned award dated 09.09.1997, learned

counsel for the appellants submits that the landowners deserve higher compensation on account of the fact that the revenue estate of village Chaklan was abutting the National Highway Ropar to Chandigarh and thus, was having greater potential value.

7. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the compensation in the present case was assessed on the basis of settlement arrived at between the members of the Action Committee (representing the landowners of the area) and the then Chief Minister, Punjab, whereby, an amount of Rs.1 lakh per acre was awarded in favour of the landowners for chahi land and Rs.80,000/- for barani Land, as such, the impugned award called for no interference.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book.

9. Perusal of record shows that the appellants-landowners themselves claimed market value before the Id. Reference Court, on the basis of decision rendered by this Court in case of "State of Punjab vs. Surjan Singh (1990 Vol.1, P.L.R. 278), which relied upon the settlement arrived at between the members of the Action Committee (representing the landowners of District Ropar) and the then Chief Minister, Punjab. Under that settlement, the market value for chahi land was fixed @ Rs.1 lakh per acre and Rs.80,000/- per acre for barani land in District Ropar and relying upon the said decision, the Id. Reference Court granted similar benefits in favour of the appellants-landowners. In such circumstances, the decision rendered by Id. Reference Court calls for no interference. Be that as it may, the appellants-landowners have not lead any other substantive evidence in

the shape of sale instance of the area concerned to show that the market value need to be enhanced.

10. Accordingly, the present appeals being devoid of merits are hereby, dismissed.

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

19.09.2025

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

sonika

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No  
Whether reportable: Yes/ No

Sr. No.	Case No.
1	RFA-2549-2002 (O&M)
2	RFA-4346-2003 (O&M)
3	RFA-4481-2003 (O&M)
4	RFA-206-2004 (O&M)
5	RFA-4487-2007 (O&M)
6	RFA-4488-2007 (O&M)
7	RFA-4489-2007 (O&M)