

RA-CW-295-2025 in CWP-5177-1997

2025:PHHC:097584-DB



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

**RA-CW-295-2025 in
CWP-5177-1997
Date of decision: 30.07.2025**

M/S. SAWAN SPINNING MILLS AND OTHERS

..... Applicant-Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

..... Respondent(s)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: Mr. Akshay Jindal, Advocate
for review applicant-writ petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Additional AG, Haryana.

LISA GILL, J.

1. This application has been filed by applicant/petitioners seeking review of decision dated 13.08.2024, whereby CWP-5177-1997, filed by present applicant was dismissed alongwith CWP-5178-1997. Applicant/writ petitioners had sought quashing of notification dated 10.05.1989 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'), notification dated 09.05.1990 under Section 6 of the Act and impugned award dated 12.11.1994.

2. It is noted in decision dated 13.08.2024 that petitioners had purchased land in question on 31.03.1989 and that construction of spinning mill was carried out subsequently. It was found that photographs taken on 16.07.1989 and 05.04.1990 depicted that construction thereof was completed between the said two dates and was still on going after issuance of notification dated 10.05.1989 under Section 4 of the Act. It is further noted that the State

RA-CW-295-2025 in CWP-5177-1997

still chose to release 03 Kanals 10 Marlas land out of 16 Kanals 17 Marlas. It is duly noted that applicant/petitioners approached this High Court in the year 1997 after having failed in their attempt to scuttle acquisition proceedings by resorting to file a civil suit. No ground to set aside impugned notification and award was found and writ petition accordingly dismissed. SLP(C)-9308-2025 filed by petitioners was disposed of vide order dated 02.04.2025 with liberty to petitioners to file a review petition, if so advised. Subsequent thereto present application has been filed on 08.07.2025.

3. Various arguments have been raised by learned counsel for applicant-petitioners to the effect that partial release of petitioners land does not negate petitioners' right to seek relief because said partial release threatens the very functionality and viability of industrial unit itself. Moreover, no opportunity of personal hearing was afforded before issuance of notification dated 09.05.1990 issued under Section 6 of the Act and that objections submitted by petitioners were never considered. It was thus prayed that present application be allowed; impugned order dated 13.08.2024 be set aside and impugned notifications dated 10.05.1989 and 09.05.1990, be quashed.

4. Learned counsel for respondents has refuted the arguments as raised. Dismissal of review application is sought.

5. Having heard learned counsel, we do not find any error apparent on the face of it in order dated 13.08.2024 or any other ground which calls for review thereof. Learned counsel for applicant in fact seeks to re-agitate the whole issue in the garb of present review application. All the pleas as raised have been succinctly dealt with in impugned decision dated 13.08.2024. It has been held by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Karnail Singh Vs. State of Haryana and others, 2024 AIR SC 2694*** that review would be permissible only if there is a mistake or error apparent on the face of record or any other sufficient reason is made out.

RA-CW-295-2025 in CWP-5177-1997

6. Learned counsel for applicant-petitioners is unable to point out any ground or sufficient reason what-so-ever which calls for review of decision dated 13.08.2024.

7. No other argument has been addressed.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, this review application is accordingly dismissed being devoid of any merit.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

30.07.2025
Sunil

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