



109-2

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

**RFA No. 2665 of 2004 (O&M) with  
Cross Objection No. 117-CI of 2009  
Date of Decision: 30.09.2025**

State of Haryana and another

...Appellants

**Versus**

Sanjeev Kumar

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Abhinash Jain, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana  
for the appellants.

Mr. Anil Dutt, Advocate  
for the respondent/cross-objector.

\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)**

Present appeal has been preferred under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (**for short "1894 Act"**), for setting aside the award dated 13.09.2004 passed by learned Additional District Judge, Sonapat (**hereinafter to be referred as "Reference Court"**).

**[2]** Also, by way of Cross-Objection No. 117-CI of 2009 preferred under Order 41 Rule 22 of CPC, the respondent prays for enhancement of the compensation awarded by the Reference Court.

**[3]** Briefly, the facts are that in pursuance of Haryana Govt. Notification dated 16.07.1996 issued under Section 4 of 1894 Act, followed by Notification dated 19.08.1997 issued under Section 6 thereof, certain land owned by the respondent situated in revenue estate of Village **Kabirpur, Tehsil & District Sonapat**, for public purpose, i.e. construction of Bye Pass from Sonapat-Rathdhana Road to Meerut-Sonapat Road in District Sonapat, was acquired. The Land Acquisition Collector (**for short "LAC"**) vide Award dated 04.08.1999, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ Rs. 3 Lakh per acre for Nahri and Chahi land.

**RFA No. 2665 of 2004 (O&M) with  
Cross Objection No. 117-CI of 2009**

[4] Dissatisfied with the aforesaid Award, landowners / interested persons, including the respondent, filed objections under Section 18 of 1894 Act, which were decided vide award dated 13.09.2004 by the learned Reference Court, whereby the market value of the acquired land was enhanced at the rate of Rs. 120/- per square yard alongwith statutory benefits. Still dissatisfied, the appellant preferred the present appeal while the respondent filed cross-objections.

[5] Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the present controversy is squarely covered with the judgment dated 09.02.2023 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Civil Appeal No. 4759 of 2011**, titled "**Jeet Singh and others Versus State of Haryana and another**" alongwith other connected cases, whereby the similarly situated landowners pertaining to the same acquisition proceedings related to the land situated in the revenue estate of Village Kabirpur, Tehsil & District Sonapat, have been held entitled for the enhanced amount of compensation @ Rs.250/- per square yard for the acquired land alongwith other benefits.

[6] Undisputedly, the land of respondent is falling within the revenue estate of Village Kabirpur, acquired vide Notification dated 16.07.1996 issued under Section 4 of 1894 Act and situated in the same vicinity as the land which was subject matter of consideration in **Jeet Singh's case (supra)**; consequently, present appeal as well as cross-objections are **disposed off** in terms of **Jeet Singh's case (supra)**.

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

**September 30, 2025**

**( HARKESH MANUJA )  
JUDGE**

'dk kamra'

Whether Speaking / Reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No