



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

207

Date of Decision: 07.08.2026

1. RA-RF-13-2020 in RFA-2523-2015

JOGINDER SINGH

...Applicant/Appellant

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

And

Sr. No.	Case No.	Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)	Respondent(s)
2.	RA-RF-10-2020 in RFA-2530-2015	Nisha Devi and Others	State of Haryana and Others
3.	RA-RF-15-2020 in RFA-2152-2015	Salinder Pal	State of Haryana and Others
4.	RA-RF-11-2020 in RFA-1346-2015	Harbans Lal (Deceased) Through LRs	State of Haryana and Others
5.	RA-RF-12-2020 in RFA-1345-2015	Khem Chand And Others	State of Haryana and Others
6.	RA-RF-21-2020 in RFA-2515-2015	Virender Kumar	State of Haryana and Others
7.	RA-RF-22-2020 in RFA-2524-2015	Hukam Chand and Others	State of Haryana and Others
8.	RA-RF-16-2020 in RFA-2526-2015	Shri Ram	State of Haryana and Others
9.	RA-RF-9-2020 in RFA-2512-2015	Narain Dutt (Deceased) Through LRs And Others	State of Haryana and Others
10.	RA-RF-17-2020 in RFA-2528-2015	Kulvinder Singh	State of Haryana and Others
11.	RA-RF-14-2020 in RFA-2518-2015	Jawahar Lal	State of Haryana and Others
12.	RA-RF-18-2020 in RFA-1344-2015	Gurnam Singh (Deceased) Through LRs	State of Haryana and Others
13.	RA-RF-34-2021 in RFA-1365-2015	Paramjit Singh	State of Haryana and Others
14.	RA-RF-20-2020 in RFA-2525-2015	Prem Chand	State of Haryana and Others

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Yesh Paul Malik, Advocate and
Mr. Ankur Malik, Advocate for applicants/appellants

Mr. Abhinash Jain, Additional Advocate General, Haryana

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate with
Ms. Surbhi Rana, Advocate for respondent-HSIIDC



JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned applications, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from ***RA-RF-13-2020*** in ***RFA-2523-2015***.

2. The applicant through instant review application is seeking review of judgment and order dated 03.03.2016 whereby this Court has determined market price of acquired land @ ₹1,013/- per sq. yard.

3. The review applicant filed ***RFA-2523-2015*** before this Court seeking enhancement of compensation determined by Reference Court. This Court vide order dated 03.03.2016 determined market value of the acquired land @ ₹1,013/- per sq. yard. Feeling dissatisfied, the petitioner filed ***SLP Nos. 1623-1624 of 2017*** which came to be disposed of by Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 12.04.2017. The operative part of the order reads as:-

“The only point involved in these cases is whether the High Court was correct in granting 12% increase on compensation awarded in Tara Chand's case in determining the quantum of compensation at Rs.1,013/- per square yard or the High Court should have applied a reverse cut in the compensation assessed in Kashmir Singh's case in which event, according to the petitioner, the compensation would have been at Rs.1,062/- per square yard. We decline to go into the said question. The same is, therefore, left to be determined by the High Court in the event the petitioners move the High Court by way of review, etc., if so advised.

The special leave petitions are disposed of in the above terms.”

4. The applicant in terms of aforesaid order of the Apex Court



preferred *RA-RF-160-CI-2017* before this Court. The aforesaid application came to be dismissed vide order dated 26.05.2017 passed by this Court. The application was dismissed on limitation as well as merit. The order dated 26.05.2017 reads as:-

“Applicant seeks condonation of delay of 410 days in filing the review application and also seeks review of the order dated 03.03.2016 passed by this Court.

After hearing the learned counsel for the applicant, no ground for interference has been made out in either of these two applications. There is hardly any explanation given for condonation of delay of 410 days in filing the review application. It is also a matter of record that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has dismissed the SLP filed by the applicant and thus, the order dated 03.03.2016 passed by this Court has attained finality. Neither any permission was sought nor any such permission was granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to the applicant for filing the present review application. Under the garb of instant review application, applicant seeks to re-argue the appeal, which is not permissible in law. In this view of the matter, neither any ground of condonation of unexplained and long delay of 410 days in filing the review application nor any ground for interference in the review application has been made out.

Dismissed”

5. The applicant filed *SLP No. 24707 of 2018* which came to be dismissed vide order dated 13.08.2018 passed by the Apex Court. Order dated 13.08.2018 reads as:-

“Delay condoned.

In view of the dismissal of similar SLPS bearing Nos. 6170-6179 of 2018 by this Court on 23.02.2018, the instant special leave petitions also stand dismissed.



Pending application, if any, is also disposed of.”

6. Like applicant, there were many other landowners whose land was acquired. They filed *RA-RF-121-CI-2018* before this Court. The aforesaid review application came to be allowed by this Court vide order dated 14.11.2018. The market value was re-determined @ ₹1,051/- per sq. yard. The applicant has filed second review application seeking review of order dated 03.03.2016 read with order dated 26.05.2017 passed by this Court.

7. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that this Court by order dated 26.05.2017 dismissed applicant's review application whereas allowed review application of similarly situated landowners. Fresh cause of action accrued in his favour on 14.11.2018 the moment favourable order was passed *qua* other landowners. On the ground of parity, the market value of applicant's land deserves to be enhanced.

8. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent submits that second review application is not maintainable. The applicant's review application was dismissed on limitation as well as merit. The applicant approached Hon'ble Supreme Court which dismissed his Special Leave Petition. It would not be appropriate to review order dated 03.03.2016 which has attained finality on account of dismissal of applicant's review application by order dated 26.05.2017 passed by this Court and Special Leave Petition by order dated 13.08.2018 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

9. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

10. Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Govt. of NCT of Delhi through its***



Secretary, Land and Building Department & Anr. Vs. M/s. K.L. Rathi Steels Ltd. & Ors., 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1090 has held that no review is available upon a change or reversal of a proposition of law by a superior Court or by larger Bench of Supreme Court overruling its earlier exposition of law whereon judgment/order under review was based. The relevant extracts of aforesaid judgment read as:-

“110. We, thus, hold that no review is available upon a change or reversal of a proposition of law by a superior court or by a larger Bench of this Court overruling its earlier exposition of law whereon the judgment/order under review was based. We also hold that notwithstanding the fact that Pune Municipal Corporation (supra) has since been wiped out of existence, the said decision being the law of the land when the Civil Appeals/Special Leave Petitions were finally decided, the subsequent overruling of such decision and even its recall, for that matter, would not afford a ground for review within the parameters of Order XLVII of the CPC.”

11. The applicant is seeking review of order 03.03.2016 read with order dated 26.05.2017 on the ground that with respect to other landowners whose land was acquired by the same notification, this Court has allowed review application, thus, applicant's review application should be allowed. He claims that applicant is seeking reconsideration of order whereby review application was dismissed.

12. The applicant is seeking review of orders 03.03.2016 read with order dated 26.05.2017 passed by this Court. It is immaterial that applicant is trying to claim that present application is not actually review application whereas it is application seeking recalling of review order dated 03.03.2016. If applicant's present application is allowed, it would entail review of order



dated 03.03.2016 passed by this Court. Claim of applicant is based upon order dated 14.11.2018 passed by this Court in review application filed by other landowners.

13. The review application filed by applicant stands dismissed vide order dated 26.05.2017. The applicant's claim on merit may be covered by order dated 14.11.2018 passed in review application, however, second review application cannot be entertained by this Court because earlier application was dismissed on merit as well as limitation and SLP against said order stands dismissed. As held by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***K.L. Rathi (supra)***, the order dated 03.03.2016 cannot be reviewed on the basis of subsequent order passed in the case of any other landowner.

14. In the backdrop, the review application stands dismissed.

15. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

07.08.2026
SDK

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