

ITEM NO.12

COURT NO.11

SECTION IVB

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil)...../2010
(CC 16403-16418/2010)
(From the judgement and order dated 26/11/2008 in RFA Nos.
2267/1990, 2268/1990, 2269/1990, 2270/1990, 2715/1990, 2716/1990
and RFA Nos.104-113/1991 of The HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH)

STATE OF PUNJAB ETC.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

GURDEV SINGH (D) TH:LRS. & ANR. ETC.

Respondent(s)

With I.A.1-16 (C/delay in filing SLP and office report)

Date: 08/11/2010 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S. SINGHVI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASOK KUMAR GANGULY

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Ajay Pal,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

These petitions are directed against judgment dated 26.11.2008
of the learned Single Judge of the Punjab and Haryana High Court,
who partly allowed the appeals filed by the land owners under
Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, enhanced the
compensation awarded to them by the Reference Court and dismissed
the appeals filed by the petitioners.

The petitioners have also filed I.A. Nos. 1 to 16 for
condonation of 583 days' delay in filing the special leave
2

petitions.

We have heard Shri Ajay Pal, learned counsel for the
petitioners and perused the record.

In our view, the cause shown by the petitioners for delayed
filing of the special leave petitions is not only laconic, but is
wholly unsatisfactory and there is no valid ground for exercise of
power by this court under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for

condonation of delay of more than 1 year and 7 months.

We are also convinced that the impugned judgment by which the learned Single Judge enhanced the compensation awarded by the Reference Court from Rs.1,00,000/- per acre to Rs.2,00,000/- per acre for Chahi land, from Rs.80,000/- per acre to Rs.1,60,000/- per acre for Barani land and from Rs.60,000/- to Rs.1,20,000/- per acre for Gair Mumkin land does not suffer from any legal infirmity. Likewise, dismissal of the appeals preferred by the petitioners also does not suffer from any legal error requiring interference under Article 136 of the Constitution.

The special leave petitions are accordingly dismissed.

(Satish K.Yadav)
Court Master

(Phoolan Wati Arora)
Court Master