

**SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - [sooperkanoon.com](http://sooperkanoon.com)**

**(hereinafter referred to as 'The Act') whereby the State of Vs. Dr.Bhagwan Singh and others .....Petitioners**

**(hereinafter referred to as 'The Act') whereby the State of Vs. Dr.Bhagwan Singh and others .....Petitioners**

**SooperKanoon Citation : [sooperkanoon.com/1063926](http://sooperkanoon.com/1063926)**

**Court : Punjab and Haryana**

**Decided On : Jul-22-2013**

**Appellant : (hereinafter referred to as 'The Act') whereby the State of**

**Respondent : Dr.Bhagwan Singh and others .....Petitioners**

**Judgement :**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH Civil Writ Petition No.15551 of 2013 Date of Decision : July 22, 2013 Dr.Bhagwan Singh and others .....Petitioners versus State of Haryana and another .....Respondents  
CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA.

\*\*\*\* Present : Mr.R.S.Bains, Advocate, for the petitioneRs.Mr.S.S.Patter, Senior DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\* 1.

Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?.

2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?.

3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?.

--- Surya Kant, J.

(Oral) Notice of motion.

Mr.S.S.Patter, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

Let two copies of the writ petition be supplied to the learned State counsel during the couRs.of day failing which this order shall be automatically recalled and the writ petition shall be deemed to have been dismissed for non- prosecution.

In view of the nature of order which we propose to pass, there is no necessity to seek any counter-reply from the respondents at this stage.

The challenge in this writ petition is to the notifications dated 15.1.2008 and 14.01.2009 issued under Sections 4 & 6, respectively, of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 Kumar Mohinder 2013.08.07 13:03 I attest to the accuracy of this order Chandigarh CWP No.15551 of 2013 [2].(hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') whereby the State of Haryana has acquired land for the development of residential Sectors 21 & 22 (part) in the urban estate, Sirsa.

The petitioners seek quashing of the notifications in respect of their land measuring 11 acres 6 kanals situated within the revenue estate of village Vaidwala, District Sirsa.

In relation to the same acquisition, we have disposed of CWP No.8694 of 2013 (Lalit Kumar versus State of Haryana and otheRs.vide order dated 16.7.2013.

The issues raised in this writ petition being identical, the same is also disposed of in terms of Lalit Kumar's case (supra).Ordered accordingly.

Dasti.

(SURYA KANT) JUDGE July 22, 2013 (SURINDER GUPTA) Mohinder JUDGE Kumar Mohinder 2013.08.07 13:03 I attest to the accuracy of this order Chandigarh