IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT JODHPUR

ORDER

S.B.Civil Writ Petition No. 7051/2006

(Lal Chand V/s Additional Collector (First)-cum-Settlement Commissioner, Sriganganagar & Ors.

Date of Order:- 20.12.2007.

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANGEET LODHA

Mr. Hemant Jain, for the petitioner.
Mr. Vijay Bijnoria, for the respondents.
Mr. B.L. Tiwari, Dy. G.A.

BY THE COURT:-

This writ petition has been preferred by the petitioner aggrieved by order impugned dated 07.12.2005 passed by Additional District Collector-cum- Settlement Commissioner, Sriganganagar, whereby an appeal preferred by the petitioner against an order dated 08.04.2003 passed by the Settlement Officer (Rehabilitation), Sriganganagar rejecting the claim of the petitioner under the provisions of the Displaced Persons (Compensation And Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (in short "the Act of 1954"), has been dismissed on the ground that in view of repeal of the Act of 1954 by the Displaced Person Claims and Other Laws Repeal Act, 2005 (38 of 2005), in absence of the saving clause therein , the proceedings cannot be

continued.

The counsel for the petitioner submits that the question involved in the matter is no more res integra. The controversy involved stands settled by the decision of the Division Bench of this court in the matter of Laxman Singh through his LRs V/s State & Ors. (D.B. Special Appeal (W) No. 762/1995 decided vide judgment dated 14.09.2006).

In the Laxman Singh's case (supra) similar controversy having been arisen, after due consideration the Division Bench of this court held as under:

"It transpired in course of hearing that the Act i.e. Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act was repealed by the Displaced Persons Claims and Other Laws Repeal Act, 2005 (38 of 2005). A question arose as to whether in view of the repeal of the enactent itself, the claim of the appellant can be considered now. Section 6 of the General Clauses Act, 1897 provides the complete answer. Section 6 lays down that where any Central Act etc. is repealed, unless a different intention appears, repeal shall not among other things "affect any right, privilege, obligation or liability acquired, accrued or incurred under any enactment so repealed" and " any such investigation, legal proceeding or remedy may be instituted, continued or enforced, as if the repealing Act had not been passed". Thus, in view of the provisions of Section 6 of the General Clause Act, notwithstanding the repeal of the Displaced Persons

(Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, the claim of the appellant being a pending claim has to be considered and taken to its logical conclusion in accordance with law. "

Thus, the writ petition deserves to be allowed in terms of the position of law settled as aforesaid by this Court, which is not disputed even by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents.

Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 07.12.2005 is set aside. The respondent No. 1 is directed to decide the appeal preferred by the petitioner in the light of the provisions of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of four months from the date of this order.

No order as to costs.

(SANGEET LODHA),J.