

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RFA-813-2021(O&M)
Date of Order: 17.11.2021

BALJEET SINGH AND ORS.

..Appellants

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANILKSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Pawan Kumar, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Surya Kumar, Advocate
for the applicants-appellants in CM-2159-CI-2021 and CM-
4491-CI-2021 in/and RFA No.813 of 2021.

Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Kunal Mulwani, Advocate
and Mr. Udit Garg, Advocate and
Mr. Yuvraj Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA Nos.490, 539 to 547, 571, 722, 903,
928, 980 and 985 of 2020.

Mr. Sachin Mittal, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA No.811 of 2021.

Mr. Gaurav Aggarwal, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA Nos.764 and 765 of 2020.

Mr. P.R. Yadav, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA Nos.3849, 3850, 3851 of 2018.

Mr. Surinder Kumar Darria, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA No.828, 832, 841 of 2021 and RFA
Nos. 1005, 1011, 1017, 1023, 1026, 1027 and 1029 of 2020.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana.
Ms. Vibha Tiwari, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Baldev Raj Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate for the HSIIDC.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

By this order a bunch of 34 appeals, (details whereof are on the
foot of the judgment), shall stand disposed of.

1. Through these appeals filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') the Landowners who stand deprived of their land due to the compulsory acquisition, assail the correctness of awards passed by the Reference Court on 31.07.2012 and 22.10.2019, respectively. The learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that this bunch of appeals can be conveniently disposed of by a common judgment.

2. With highest regard to the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to avoid reproduction and individually record the adjudication upon questions pertaining to land acquired in different villages, it is observed that in a significant number of appeals listed before this Bench, the land has been acquired through a common notification involving identical issues, which have already been sufficiently and elaborately dealt with, in the previous judgments. Hence, certain extracts from the previous judgments, have been reproduced in this judgment, for the sake of convenience, clarity and judicious use of time. In all these cases, the following issues arise for consideration:-

1. *Whether the parties have produced comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period to enable the Court to assess the market value of the acquired land as prevalent on the date of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894?*
2. *Whether the landowners of the acquired land can be deprived of just, fair and reasonable compensation, although they have failed to claim the amount as per the policy decision of the State?*
3. *Whether the Court is required to assess the severance damages suffered by the landowners with regard to the bifurcation of their land into*

different parcels due to the compulsory acquisition of a narrow strip of the land for constructing an elevated express highway?

The discussion on issue number 2 and 3 involves common questions which have been, comprehensively, answered in the previous judgments arising from the same notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Hence, there is some amount of reproduction.

3. FACTS

3.1. Some facts are required to be noticed. The State of Haryana in order to use the land for developing and constructing Kundali Manesar Express Highway (hereinafter referred to as “KMP”) Phase VII connecting NH No.1, 10, 8 and 2, issued a notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 11.01.2005 proposing to acquire land measuring 520 acres, 2 kanals and 30.5 marlas spread over a total of 15 villages. The declaration under Section 6 of the 1894 Act was published on 31.05.2005 whereas the award No.19 was announced on 10.05.2006 with respect the acquired land located in Patli Hazipur. The landowners were held entitled to a uniform market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.12,50,000 per acre. In the first round, on 02.08.2012 the Reference Court, assessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.43,17,841/- per acre. While deciding appeals, the High Court vide judgment dated 05.02.2016 revised the market value of the acquired land to Rs.62,11,700/- per acre. However, the Hon’ble Supreme Court vide judgment dated 25.1.2018 in **Surender Singh vs. State of Haryana and others (2018) 3 SCC 278** remanded all the cases back to the Reference Court wherein the parties were permitted to lead further evidence.

In the second round, the Reference Court has dismissed the various

reference petitions while upholding the assessment made by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as “LAC”) at Rs.12,50,000/- per acre vide judgment dated 22.10.2019. A few prior appeals arising from the judgment of the Reference Court dated 31.07.2012 have also been listed along with, which shall be disposed of as well.

3.2 At this stage, it would be important to note that in the village Patli Hazipur itself, 960 kanals and 4 marlas of land, in other words, 120 acres of land, approximately, has been acquired. Normally, each acre of land consist of 4840 sq. yards of the land which is further equal to 8 kanals. Thus, each kanal of land normally has 605 sq. yards area which is further equivalent to 20 marlas. Ordinarily, each marla of an agricultural land consists of a little more than 30 sq. yards land. In cities, normally, 500 sq. yards are considered equivalent to 1 kanal. However, in the Northern India, for the purposes of agricultural land, normally 1 acre of land consists of 160 marlas of land.

4. ORAL EVIDENCE

4.1. The reference Court, on appreciating the pleadings, framed the following issues:-

- “1. What was the market value of the acquired land on the date of notification u/s 4 of Land Acquisition Act? OPP
2. Relief.”

4.2 The landowners in order to prove their case led the following oral evidence:-

- “1. Med Singh as PW1;
2. Suresh Kumar, Assistant Draftsman from the Office of District Town Planner, Gurugram as PW2;
3. Jagdish Chander, Halqa Patwari, Taj Nagar, District Gurugram as PW3;

4. *Dalbir Singh, Halqa Patwari, Village Dhana, District Gurugram as PW4;*
5. *Parveen Kumar, Halqa Patwari, Village Patli Hazipur as PW5;*
6. *Nand Kumar Nagpal, Government approved Valuer as PW6; and,*
7. *Dharampal as PW7”*

4.3 The landowners submitted the following documentary evidence:-

<i>Ex.P1</i>	<i>Copy of Girdawari</i>
<i>Ex.P2</i>	<i>Aksh Shijra</i>
<i>Ex.P3/P19</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.1954 dated 20.10.2005 vide which land measuring 19K-9 ½ M situated in Village Patli Hajipur was sold for ₹ 60 lakh.</i>
<i>Ex.P4&P5</i>	<i>Bills of pipes</i>
<i>Ex.P6</i>	<i>Copy of award dated 27.02.2012 passed by the Court of Shri Vikram Aggarwal, the then learned ADJ, Gurugram in case titled as 'Hari Mohan and others Vs. State of Haryana and others'</i>
<i>Ex.P7</i>	<i>Copy of award dated 18.12.2010 passed by the Court of Shri Y. S. Rathor, the then learned ADJ, Gurugram in case titled as 'Avtar Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others'</i>
<i>Ex.P8</i>	<i>Copy of award dated 30.11.2010 passed by the Court of Shri Y. S. Rathor, the then learned ADJ, Gurugram in case titled as 'Hari Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others'</i>
<i>Ex.P9</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.2737 dated 28.1.2006 vide which land measuring 9K-12M situated in Village Jarola was sold for ₹ 5,90,00,000/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P10</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.2818 dated 16.10.2007 vide which land measuring 39K-17M situated in Village Bawra Bankipur was sold for ₹ 6,42,58,125/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P11</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.2180 dated 28.04.2004 vide which land measuring 96K-13M situated in Village Naharpur Kasan was sold for ₹ 13,62,00,000/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P12</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.2274 dated 21.11.2005 vide which land measuring 40K-10M situated in Village Bawra Bankipur was sold for ₹ 1,25,00,000/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P13</i>	<i>Copy of conveyance deed No.12365 dated 20.08.2008 vide which plot measuring 450 sq. mtrs.</i>

	<i>situated in Manesar was sold for ₹ 11,25,000/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P14</i>	<i>Copy of conveyance deed No.21507 dated 09.01.2009 vide which plot measuring 7875 sq. mtrs. situated in Manesar was sold for ₹ 1,46,69,500/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P15</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.171 dated 30.04.2009 vide which land measuring 18K-16M situated in Village Bawra Bankipur was sold for ₹ 4,70,00,000/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P16</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.2823 dated 16.10.2007 vide which land measuring 8K-0M situated in Village Bawra Bankipur was sold for ₹ 1,29,00,000/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P17</i>	<i>Copy of conveyance deed No.11926 dated 13.08.2008 vide which plot measuring 1800 sq. mtrs. situated in Manesar was sold for ₹ 39,60,000/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P18</i>	<i>Copy of conveyance deed No.21520 dated 12.01.2009 vide which plot measuring 450 sq. mtrs. situated in Manesar was sold for ₹ 8,38,260/-.</i>
<i>Ex.P20</i>	<i>Aksh Shijra of Village Saidpur.</i>
<i>Mark-A</i>	<i>Copy of LAC Award No.19 dated 10.05.2006.</i>
<i>Ex.PW2/A</i>	<i>Copy of site plan.</i>
<i>Ex.PW3/A</i>	<i>Aksh shijra of Village Bawra Bakipur</i>
<i>Ex.PW6/1</i>	<i>Copy of Inspection Report of land belonging to Dharampal and others petitioners.</i>
<i>Ex.PW6/2</i>	<i>Copy of site plan.</i>
<i>Ex.PX</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.575 dated 09.06.2009 vide which land measuring 5K-14M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for ₹ 64,12,500/-.</i>
<i>Ex.PX/1</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 2001-02 of Village Patli Hazipur.</i>
<i>Ex.PX5</i>	<i>Copy of khasra girdawari of Village Kasan.</i>
<i>Ex.PW6</i>	<i>Aksh Shijra of Village Kasan.</i>
<i>Ex.PX7</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 1993-94 of Village Naharpur Kasan.</i>
<i>Ex.PX8</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 1998-99 of Village Naharpur Kasan.</i>
<i>Ex.PX9</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 1991-92 of Village Khoh.</i>
<i>Ex.PX10</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 1996-97 of Village Khoh.</i>
<i>Ex.PX11</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 1991-92 of Village Manesar.</i>
<i>Ex.PX12</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 1996-97 of Village Naharpur Kasan.</i>

<i>Ex.PX13/PX14/PX16</i>	<i>Aksh Shijra of Village Patli Hazipur.</i>
<i>Ex.PX15</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi for the year 2011-12 of Village Patli Hazipur.</i>
<i>Ex.PA</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi of Village Patli Hazipur for the year 2001-02.</i>
<i>Ex.PB</i>	<i>Copy of jamabandi of Village Parli Hazipur for the year 1996-97.</i>
<i>Ex.PC</i>	<i>Copy of Aksh Shijra of Village Patli Hazipur.</i>
<i>Ex.PY</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.345 dated 25.05.2009 vide which land measuring 24K-1M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for ₹ 2,70,00,000/-.</i>

4.4 On the other hand, HSIIDC examined Dheerja Ram, Manager IA(KMP Cell), HSIIDC, Udyog Vihar, Gurugram, as DW-1, Dhani Ram, Patwari from the office of HSIIDC, Udyog Vihar as RW-2. After the cases were remanded back, by the Supreme Court, Dhani Ram, Patwari was, once again, examined as RW-2. Apart from that, the HSIIDC produced the following documentary evidence:-

<i>Ex.R1</i>	<i>Copy of map of KMP Express Highway</i>
<i>Ex.R2</i>	<i>Copy of Collector Rates</i>
<i>Ex.R3</i>	<i>Copy of letter sent by LAC to Financial Commissioner</i>
<i>Ex.R4/13</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.2008 dated 10.12.2004 vide which land measuring 87K-11M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for ₹34,96,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R5/R15</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.1300 dated 3.9.2004 R15 vide which land measuring 18K-0M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for, ₹10,80,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R6/R14</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.1297 dated 3.9.2004 vide which land measuring 24K-0M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for ₹14,40,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R7/R16</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.1298 dated 3.9.2004 vide which land measuring 34K-0M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for ₹20,40,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R8/R17</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.1299 dated 3.9.2004 vide which land measuring 15K-19M situated in Village Patli</i>

	<i>Hazipur was sold for ₹9,57,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R9</i>	<i>Copy of policy for rehabilitation and resettlement of land owners</i>
<i>Ex.R10</i>	<i>Copy of award dated 2.4.2011 passed by the Court of Shri S. K. Kaushik, the then learned ADJ, Palwal in case titled as 'Roop Chand and others Vs. State of Haryana and others'</i>
<i>Ex.R11</i>	<i>Copy of award dated 25.8.2011 passed by the Court of Shri S. K. Kaushik, the then learned ADJ, Palwal in case titled as Shum Vs. State of Haryana and others'</i>
<i>Ex.R12</i>	<i>Integrated sajzra plan of revenue estate of Village Patli Hazipur</i>
<i>Ex.R18</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.97 dated 15.4.2005 vide which land measuring 31K-8M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for ₹13,00,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R19</i>	<i>Copy of sale deed No.438 dated 19.5.2005 vide which land measuring 16K-0M situated in Village Patli Hazipur was sold for ₹6,40,000/-</i>

4.5 Heard learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the judgment passed by the reference Court along with the record of the reference Court which was requisitioned.

4.6 It may be noted here that an application for permission to lead additional evidence filed in RFA No.813 of 2021 was allowed in view of no objection raised by the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC who has also stated that the HSIIDC does not intend to lead any further evidence. In the additional evidence, the landowners have produced a copy of the sale deed dated 16.02.2004, of a constructed plot of 1 kanals and 13 marlas of land located in Village Farrukh Nagar which was sold for a total sale consideration of Rs.22,00,000/-, a report dated 27.10.2012, of the surveyor, loss assessor, registered valuer and estimator, an aerial distance matrix of Patli Hajipur from prominent locations in the surroundings and an integrated

revenue layout plan of the revenue estate of Village Patli Hajipur.

4.7 The Reference Court has compiled the details of the sale deeds
relied upon by the landowners, in a tabulated form, which has been modified
while includinig the sale exemplar produced in the additional evidence:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Exhibits</i>	<i>Vasika No.and Date</i>	<i>Area K- M</i>	<i>Sale Consideration (in ₹)</i>	<i>Rate per acre (in ₹)</i>	<i>Revenue Estate of Village</i>
1.	Ex.P3/ Ex.P19	1954 dated 20.10.2005	19-9 ½	60 lakh	24,64,698/-	Patli Hazipur
2.	Ex.P9	2737 dated 28.01.2006	9-12	5 crore	4,16,66,666/-	Judola
3.	Ex.P10	2818 dated 16.10.2007	39-17	6,42,58,125/-	1,29,00,000/-	Babra Bakipur
4.	Ex.P11	2180 dated 28.04.2004	96-13	13,62,00,000/-	1,12,73,667/-	Naharpur Kasan
5.	Ex.P12	2274 dated 21.11.2005	40-10	1,25,00,000/-	24,69,135/-	Bawra Bankipur
6.	Ex.P13	12365 dated 20.08.2008	450 sq.mtrs.	11,25,000/-	1,12,50,000/-	Manesar
7.	Ex.P14	21507 dated 09.01.2009	7875 sq.mtrs.	1,46,69,500/-	77,20,790/-	Manesar
8.	Ex.P15	171 dated 30.04.2009	18-16	4,70,00,000/-	1,60,00,000/-	Bawra Bankipur
9.	Ex.P16	2823 dated 16.10.2007	8-0	1,29,00,000/-	1,29,00,000/-	--
10.	Ex.P17	11926 dated 13.08.2008	1800 sq.mtrs.	39,60,000/-	99 lakh	Manesar
11.	Ex.P18	21520 dated 12.01.2009	450 sq.mtrs.	8,38,260/-	84,00,000/-	Manesar
12.	Ex.P18	21520 dated 12.01.2009	450 sq.mtrs.	8,38,260/-	84,00,000/-	Manesar
13.	Ex.PX	575 dated 09.06.2009	5-14	64,12,500/-	90 lakh	Patli Hazipur
14.	Ex.PY	345 dated 25.05.2009	24-1	2,70,00,000/-	89,81,288/-	Patli Hazipur
15.	Additional evidence	16.02.2004	1-13	22,00,000/-	1,06,66,667/-	Farrukh Nagar

4.8 On the other hand, the HSIIDC has produced the following sale
deeds:-

Sr. No.	Exhibits	Vasika No. and Date	Area K-M	Sale Consideration (in ₹)	Rate per acre (in ₹)	Revenue Estate of Village
1.	Ex.R8/R13	2008/10.12.2004	87K-11M	34,96,000/-	3.2 lakh	Patli Hazipur
2.	Ex.R5/R15	1300/03.09.2004	18 kanals	10,80,000/-	7 lakh	..
3.	Ex.R6/R14	1297/3.09.2004	24 kanals	14,40,000/-	5 lakh (approx.)	..
4.	Ex.R9/R16	1298/3.9.2004	34 kanals	20,40,000/-	5 lakh (approx.)	..
5.	Ex.R8/R17	1299/3.9.2004	15 kanals	9,57,000/-	5 lakh (approx.)	..
6.	Ex.R18	97/15.4.2005	31-8	13 lakh	3,12,210/-	..
7.	Ex.R19	438/19.5.2005	16-0	6,40,000/-	3,20,000/-	..

5. ARGUMENTS OF LEARNED COUNSEL REPRESENTING THE RESPECTIVE PARTIES:-

5.1. The learned Senior counsel representing the appellant contends that the Reference Court has committed an error in dismissing the reference applications as it ought to have followed the assessment made by the Supreme Court in **Wazir and another Vs. State of Haryana and other connected cases, 2019(13) SCC 101**. The learned counsel while referring to the judgment has stated that HSIIDC had previously also, acquired land in the concerned area and the Supreme Court had assessed the market value of the nearby parcels of land. The learned Senior counsel further relied upon the judgment passed in **M/s Acquainted Realtors LLP Etc. Etc. Vs. State of Haryana and others AIR 2021 (SC) 1969**. While reading the judgment in extenso, he contends that the Supreme Court has held that the Court should not ignore the market value assessed by the Supreme Court while assessing the market value in a subsequent acquisition. He contends that this Court should grant 8% flat increase over the market value assessed by the Court in **Wazir and another (Supra)**.

5.2 Per contra, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC has stated that since the landowners have failed to produce comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period, therefore, the Reference Court has correctly dismissed the reference applications.

6. DISCUSSION:-
ISSUE NO.1

6.1 From a careful perusal of the tabulated information compiled in paragraph 3.6, it is apparent that the owners have produced only three sale exemplars of sale of the land located in Village Patli Hajipur namely Ex.P-3, PX and PY. All the three sale exemplars are relating to the period post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, i.e. 11.01.2005. It is well settled that ordinarily the sale exemplar after the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act should not be relied upon. Furthermore, even the documents produced in additional evidence produced by the landowners do not advance their cause as it relates to a constructed plot located in Village Farrukh Nagar. There is no evidence to prove that the aforesaid sale deed is of a plot of a comparative value with the acquired land. Additionally, from a careful perusal of the sale exemplars produced by HSIIDC compiled in para 3.7 viz-a-viz the layout plan Ex.R-12, it is apparent that some part of the land sold through sale exemplar Ex.R-19, on 19.05.2005, also forms a part of the acquired land. Although, no doubt, this sale instance is also subsequent to the date of notification, however, this sale exemplar at least can help the Court to arrive at a just conclusion that the prices of the area did not increase exponentially even after the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act i.e. 11.01.2005. Through this

sale exemplar, 2 acres of land was sold at the rate of Rs.3,20,000/- per acre. Furthermore, 11 acres of land has been sold through sale exemplar Ex.R-4, dated 10.12.2004, which is located at a distance of approximately 11 acres from the acquired land. Further, after examining sale exemplar Ex.R-18, along with the layout plan Ex.R-12, it becomes evident that the parcel of land measuring 31 kanals and 8 marlas (nearly 4 acres) has been sold at that rate of Rs.3,31,210/-. No doubt, this sale exemplar is also subsequent to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, however, this parcel of land is located only at a distance of one acre from the acquired land. In view of the aforesaid documents, it can safely be concluded that the market value of the acquired land, at the relevant time, was not what is being claimed by the landowners.

6.2 Now, let us analyse the arguments of learned Senior counsel representing the landowners.

6.3 It may be noted here that in **Wazir and another (Supra)**, the Supreme Court assessed the market value of the acquired land through various notifications. In that judgment, the Hon'ble Supreme Court adjudicated the market value of acquired land located in Villages Kasan, Bas Kusla, Naharpur Kasan, Manesar, Bas Haria and Dhana. The various notifications under Section 4 of the 1894 Act were issued for acquiring land for development of industrial model township at Manesar in District Gurugram. This Bench has carefully read the aforesaid judgment passed in **Wazir and another (Supra)**. With greatest respect, the aforesaid judgment is not applicable in the facts of the present case. It may be noted here that the Supreme Court itself, in innumerable judgments, has held that outright

reliance on the assessment made by the Supreme Court, as regards the market value with respect to acquisition of the nearby land, should be avoided and the Court must endeavour to determine the market value on the basis of the evidence produced before it. While deciding RFA No.684 of 2021, by this Bench, the appeals arising from compulsory acquisition of the land located in another village by the same notification, this aspect has been examined in-depth and the relevant discussion has been reproduced as under:-

“9.14 This issue is no longer res-integra. Recently, in Manoj Kumar etc. vs. State of Haryana and others (2018) 13 SCC 96, the Supreme Court has held that while assessing the market value, the Court is required to evaluate the various factors which goes to impact such a determination depending upon the peculiar facts governing each case. There cannot be any hard or fast rule for assessment of the market value. Common sense is the best and most reliable guide. While denouncing the practice of the courts to place an outright reliance on the previous judgments, the Supreme Court has declared that the decision cannot be applied ipso facto to the facts of the subsequent cases neglecting the other evidence. The Court has further warned of the ill effects of such an approach. The relevant discussion is in paras 11 to 14, which are extracted as under:-

“11. In our opinion, the High Court could not have placed an outright reliance on Swaran Singh case [Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044], without considering the nature of transaction relied upon in the said decision. The decision could not have been applied ipso facto to the facts of the instant case. In such cases, where such judgments/awards are relied on as evidence, though they are relevant, but cannot be said to be binding with respect to the determination of the price, that has to depend on the evidence adduced in the case. However, in the instant case, it appears that the land in Swaran Singh case [Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044] was situated just across the road as observed by the High Court as such it is relevant evidence but not binding. As such it could have been taken into consideration

due to the nearness of the area, but at the same time what was the nature of the transaction relied upon in the said case was also required to be looked into in an objective manner. Such decisions in other cases cannot be adopted without examining the basis for determining compensation whether sale transaction referred to therein can be relied upon or not and what was the distance, size and also bona fide nature of transaction before such judgments/awards are relied on for deciding the subsequent cases. It is not open to accepting determination in a mechanical manner without considering the merit. Such determination cannot be said to be binding.

12. We have come across several decisions where the High Court is adopting the previous decisions as binding. The determination of compensation in each case depends upon the nature of land and what is the evidence adduced in each case, may be that better evidence has been adduced in later case regarding the actual value of property and subsequent sale deeds after the award and before preliminary notification under Section 4 are also to be considered, if filed. It is not proper to ignore the evidence adduced in the case at hand. The compensation cannot be determined by blindly following the previous award/judgment. It has to be considered only a piece of evidence, not beyond that. The court has to apply the judicial mind and is supposed not to follow the previous awards without due consideration of the facts and circumstances and evidence adduced in the case in question. The current value reflected by comparable sale deeds is more reliable and binding for determination of compensation in such cases award/judgment relating to an acquisition made before 5 to 10 years cannot form the safe basis for determining compensation. 13. The awards and judgment in the cases of others not being inter parties are not binding as precedents. Recently, we have seen the trend of the courts to follow them blindly probably under the misconception of the concept of equality and fair treatment. The courts are being swayed away and this approach in the absence of and similar nature and situation of land is causing more injustice and tantamount to giving equal treatment in the case of unequals. As per situation of a village, nature of land, its value differ from distance to distance,

even two to three kilometre distance may also make the material difference in value. Land abutting highway may fetch higher value but not land situated in interior villages.

14. The previous awards/judgments are the only piece of evidence on a par with comparative sale transactions. The similarity of the land covered by previous judgment/award is required to be proved like any other comparative exemplar. In case previous award/judgment is based on exemplar, which is not similar or acceptable, previous award/judgment of court cannot be said to be binding. Such determination has to be outrightly rejected. In case some mistake has been done in awarding compensation, it cannot be followed; on the ground of parity an illegality cannot be perpetuated. Such award/judgment would be wholly irrelevant.”

9.15 In the considered view of this Court, the determination of the market value of the land on the basis of comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period is the most preferred and logical method to arrive at a fair and true market value. While deciding such cases, the Court is required to adopt a holistic approach. The Court is expected to assess a just and appropriate market value on the basis of the evidence produced. In such circumstances, comparable sale deeds offer a good solution to the problem. They are considered as the best evidence to prove a fact being in the nature of direct evidence and help the Court to assess the market value more accurately and realistically. Once comparable sale deeds of the contemporaneous period are available to guide the court, it is not safe to rely upon a previous judicial assessment of the market value while ignoring the sale deeds which reflect the most accurate market value of the property on which a seller voluntarily offers to sell the property on receipt of the amount from a willing purchaser. Unless the correctness of the price, reflected in these sale deeds, is disputed on any ground duly proved, the court can safely rely upon the same for assessing the market value. If there are a large number of comparable sale deeds of the contemporaneous period, the Court can, with reasonable certainty, assess the market value while relying upon such sale instances.

9.16 Furthermore, while assessing the market value of the acquired land under the 1894 Act, the Court is required to apply the test of preponderance of probabilities. Thus, the Court assesses the market value on the basis of the evidence produced. If the parties fail to produce sufficient evidence or

the best evidence, the assessment of the court has to be on the basis of whatever evidence has been produced. In such circumstances, it may not be a true reflection of the market value prevailing at the relevant time. Hence, reliance on the previous judicial decision/ determination may not be a safe method to calculate the market value particularly in a case where the direct evidence like sale exemplars of the relevant period have been produced. In such an eventuality, the court should prefer to assess the market value on the basis of the sale exemplars. Undoubtedly, under Article 142 of The Constitution of India, the law declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is binding on all the courts, however, assessment of market value of the acquired land in a particular case in the absence of any declaration of law made on a particular point, is only a decision given on the facts of that particular case and such a decision merely on the question of fact is not binding. What is binding is the ratio of the decision and not any finding on facts, or the opinion of the court on any question which was only incidental in nature or was not required to be decided in a particular case. While assessing the market value of the acquire land, with highest respect, the Hon'ble Supreme Court does not as a ratio decidendi lays down a principle of law which is binding on all the courts. As correctly observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Manoj Kumar's case (supra), such decision is only a piece of evidence produced for consideration of the court. However, in the appropriate cases, in the absence of any other evidence, the Presiding Judge may not be left with any choice but to rely upon the same in the absence of any other reliable or relevant evidence. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Krishena Kumar vs. Union of India and others (1990) 4 SCC 207, while expounding on the phrase 'Ratio Decidendi' has held as under:-

“20. In other words, the enunciation of the reason or principle upon which a question before a court has been decided is alone binding as a precedent. The ratio decidendi is the underlying principle, namely, the general reasons or the general grounds upon which the decision is based on the test or abstract from the specific peculiarities of the particular case which gives rise to the decision. The ratio decidendi has to be ascertained by an analysis of the facts of the case and the process of reasoning involving the major premise consisting of a preexisting rule of law, either statutory or judge-made, and a minor premise consisting of the material facts of the case under immediate consideration. If it is not clear, it is not the duty of the court to spell it out with difficulty in order to be bound by it. In the words of Halsbury (4th edn.,

Vol. 26, para 573) "The concrete decision alone is binding between the parties to it but it is the abstract ratio decidendi, as ascertained on a consideration of the judgment in relation to the subject matter of the decision, which alone has the force of law and which when it is clear it is not part of a tribunal's duty to spell out with difficulty a ratio decidendi in order to bound by it, and it is always dangerous to take one or two observations out of a long judgment and treat them as if they gave the ratio decidendi of the case. If more reasons than one are given by a tribunal for its judgment, all are taken as forming the ratio decidendi."

9.17 *This Court has carefully read the judgment passed in Wazir (supra). In that case, Ex.P4 was a sale deed dated 18.08.2008 relating to the sale of a plot measuring 1 kanal and 4 marlas in village Kasan, which has not been produced in the present case. The Supreme Court, while considering the matter, has assessed the market value of the acquired land. In the absence of the sale deed dated 18.08.2003, it is not appropriate to rely upon the assessment made in Wazir's case (supra) while ignoring the sale exemplars produced by the State."*

6.4 The Reference Court has committed an error in ignoring the sale instances produced by the HSIIDC on the ground that the sale exemplars are reflecting a lesser market value than what was awarded by the Land Acquisition Collector. It may be noted here that Section 25 of the 1894 Act, does not prohibit the Reference Court to take into consideration the sale exemplar(s) reflecting a lesser value than the amount assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector. Section 25 only debars the Reference Court from reducing the market value below the market value assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector. Reference in this regard can be placed on judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Lal Chand Vs. Union of India, 2009(15) SCC 769.**

6.5 The learned Senior counsel has firmly relied upon a recent

judgment of the Supreme Court in *M/s Acquainted Realtors (Supra)*. By this judgment a batch of various appeals assailing the correctness of the judgment passed by the High Court on 01.06.2018, was decided. After discussing the matter, the Supreme Court held as under:-

*“14. Guided by the rule of thumb stated in said decision, and even while considering that the lands in the instant case were agricultural in nature and away from the Highway, in our considered view, two aspects detailed hereinabove, definitely weigh in favour of the landholders. At the same time, it cannot be ignored that the values arrived at in **HSI IDC vs. Roshan Lal and others** (in the light of subsequent decision in **Wazir and another vs. State of Haryana, (2019) 13 SCC 101**) were themselves on the higher side. Although, the decision in **HSI IDC vs. Roshan Lal and others** was not challenged by the State, the fact remains that the values assessed in that decision were theoretically on a higher scale and the landholders, on that score, have received an advantage.*

*15. In the totality of circumstances, in our view, the landholders must be held entitled to 8% flat increase over the market value assessed in **HSI IDC vs. Roshan Lal and others**. in respect of lands from villages which were found to be comparable. The landholders must therefore get enhancement to the tune of 8% over Rs.43,61,400 per acre that is to say Rs.47,10,312 per acre (rounded off to Rs.47,10,500 per acre). Needless to say that they shall also be entitled to all the statutory benefits.”*

6.6 From the aforesaid relevant portion extracted above, it is apparent that in the facts of that case, the Supreme Court held that the landowners are entitled to 8% flat increase over the market value assessed in **HSI IDC Vs. Roshan Lal and others, 2019(13) SCC 101**, in respect of different parcels of the land from the villages which were found to be comparable. It is apparent that the land of Village Patli Hajipur was neither the subject

matter of any finding arrived at by the Supreme Court in Wazir Singh's case nor in Roshan Lal's case and nor in M/s Acquainted Realtors case. Hence, the aforesaid judgment cannot be relied upon in the manner suggested by the learned counsel representing the landowners.

6.7 Although the learned counsel representing the respective parties have not referred to the any other evidence, this Court, being the First Appellate Court is required to examine the documents on record. Ex.P6 is a previous judgment passed by the Court, in the first round, on 31.07.2012. The same has already been set aside in *Surender Singh's case (supra)*. Ex.PX/1, Ex.PY and Ex.P9 are judgments passed by the Reference Court which also stand set aside. Ex.PW5/7 is a copy of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in *Surender Singh's case (supra)*. Ex.P7 is a award dated 18.12.2010, passed by the Reference Court in Avtar Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others, with respect to acquisition of land vide notification dated 29.09.2005 (under Section 4 of the 1894 Act) concerning the land located in Village Dhana. The aforesaid award passed by the Reference Court does not advance the cause of the landowners particularly when the sale exemplar of the acquired land itself is available. Similarly, Ex.P8 is an award passed by the Reference Court with respect to acquisition of land in Villages Bas Khusla, Bas Hariya, Dhana and Kasan. In the before-mentioned award, the acquisition proceedings were initiated by notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 26.02.2002. As already noticed, the aforesaid judgment cannot be relied upon particularly when the sale exemplars of the acquired land and the parcels of land located nearby are available. The landowners have also failed to prove that the land located in

District Palwal is in any manner comparable to the land acquired in the present case.

6.8 The learned Senior counsel appearing for the landowners has also relied upon the sale deed Ex.P3 executed on 20.10.2005, which is nine months later than the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 11.01.2005. Through sale deed (Ex.P3), the land was sold at the rate of Rs.24,64,698/- per acre. It may be noted here that this sale exemplar is post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act and, therefore, should not be relied upon particularly when the evidence of the comparable sale deeds of contemporaneous period are available.

6.9. However, there is a another very important aspect of the matter which needs to be examined. It has been noticed that a few appeals of the year 2012 have been listed, along with the present appeals, by the office. These judgments have been filed against the judgment of the Reference Court dated 31.07.2012. The judgment of the Reference Court dated 31.07.2012, was modified by the High Court vide judgment dated 06.02.2016, wherein, the market value of the acquired land was revised to Rs.62,11,700/- per acre. However, the Supreme Court vide judgment in **Surender Singh (Supra)** set aside not only the judgment of the High Court but also that of the Reference Court. Thus, the judgment under challenge has already been set aside. The learned counsel representing the parties are *ad idem* that rather than remitting the matter back to the Reference Court for re-decision in accordance with the judgment in Surender Singh's case, these appeals also be decided along with the appeals arising from the judgment of the Reference Court dated 22.10.2019. This Court has examined the

aforesaid aspect and considers the request of the learned counsel representing the parties appropriate. Once the parties have themselves state that they do not wish to lead any further evidence and the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, is the same, in all the appeals filed in past and present, therefore, the old appeals shall also be disposed of along with this batch of appeals.

ISSUE NO.2

7. In order to avoid repetition, it may be noted here that while deciding the appeals from the same notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, relating to the acquired land located in Village Sultanpur, in **RFA No.421 of 2021, titled as “HSI IDC Vs. Om Dutt and others”**, decided on 07.10.2021, it has been observed as under:-

*“8.18 There is another aspect of the matter which has come to the notice of the court and in the considered view, the same should not be ignored. The Reference Court or the Appellate Court under the 1894 Act is expected to ensure that the land owners get appropriate just and proper compensation for the compulsory acquisition of the land. It is the responsibility of the Court to assess the market value irrespective of the fact that whether the land owners have claimed appropriate amount or not? In **Narender Singh and others vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2017) 9 SCC 426**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court after noticing that the High Court did not grant appropriate amount as assessed on the ground that the land owners failed to claim the amount held that it is the duty of the court to ensure that the land owners get appropriate compensation for the compulsorily acquired land. It has come to the notice of the Court that State of Haryana took a policy decision. The first policy decision by the State was taken on 28.04.2005. Such decision was made applicable w.e.f. 05.03.2005. The land situated in the State was divided into three different zones for the purpose of fixing floor rates for land acquisition. In this policy decision, the Government decided that irrespective of the date of notification under Section 4 if the award of the LAC is*

made on or after 05.03.2005, the amount to be determined by the LAC shall not be less than what was decided in the aforesaid policy. The present case falls in category (ii) in para 5. The policy decision is extracted as under:-

“Subject:- Fixation of floor rates for acquisition of land for public purpose in the State of Haryana.

Sir,

I am directed to refer to the subject cited and to state that the State Government has been acquiring land for public purposes for various departments as well as other State Agencies. Under the present system compensation is paid to the land owners based on the rate fixed by the Committee constituted under the Chairmanship of Divisional Commissioner vide this department letter No. 3670- R-5- 95/8943, dated 20.6.1995. This Committee had been recommending rates based on the quality, category and location of the land under acquisition.

2. It has been the general experience that the rates of compensation fixed for acquisition are quite low as compared to the market rates prevalent in that area. Consequently, the land owners have to approach the Courts for enhancing the compensation paid to them and this process of litigation takes a substantial time. Agricultural land all over the State has become very valuable and more so in the region surrounding Delhi. The farmer who is deprived of his only livelihood is entitled to a fair compensation based on the market rates prevalent in the area.

3. The question of bringing about an improvement in the system by fixing a minimum floor rate and thereby ensure payment of fair compensation to the farmers based on the market rates, has been under the active consideration of the State Government. The system of acquisition followed by the Delhi Administration as well as by the NOIDA operating in the NCR has also been studied.

4. It has now been decided by the Government that the State be divided into

following Zones for the purpose of fixing floor rates of land acquisition:-

- i) The urbanisable area as shown in the Gurgaon Development Plan.*
- ii) Rest of the NCR sub-region of Haryana including Panchkula and periphery of Chandigarh forming part of Haryana State.*
- iii) Rest of the State outside Haryana sub-region of NCR.*

5. After due consideration, it has further been decided to fix the following floor rates for the above three Zones for acquisition of land for public purpose:

- i) The urbanisable area of Gurgaon will have a minimum floor rates of Rs. 15.00 lacs per acre.*
- ii) Rest of the Haryana sub-region of NCR including Panchkula and area of Chandigarh periphery in the Haryana State will have a minimum floor rate of Rs. 12.50 lacs per acre.*
- iii) For the rest of the State minimum floor rate will be Rs. 5.00 lacs per acre.*
- iv) These rates do not include the solatium and interest payable under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act.*

6. The Committee headed by the Divisional Commissioner will continue to perform its duties while fixing the rate of compensation for various categories of land under acquisition based on these floor rates. It will continue to take into account all these parameters for working out the land acquisition rate being followed at present while communicating the rate to the Acquiring Departments/Agencies in the State.”

9. Thereafter, Government of Haryana, issued letter dated 25.5.2005 clarifying about applicability of the aforesaid instructions/ policy dated 28.4.2005 with regard to fixation of floor price of acquired land for public purposes in the State. The relevant extract thereof is as under:-

“After a careful and detailed consideration, it has been decided that no award for acquisition of land to be announced on/ after 5th March 2005 shall be on rates lower than the floor rates, communicated to you vide this department letter dated 28-4-2005. The other provisions of the

communication dated 28-4-05 will remained unchanged.”

8.19 *The aforesaid policy decision has been revised on 06.04.2007 while increasing the minimum floor rates in the State of Haryana for the acquisition of the land in the State of Haryana, which is extracted as under:-*

"Sub: Fixation of floor rates for the acquisition of land for public purpose in the State of Haryana.

Ref: This Department Memo No. 2025-R-5-2005/4299,dated 28.4.2005.

Vide this Department Memo. under reference, minimum floor rates for acquiring land for public purposes for various Departments as well as other State Agencies were fixed by the Haryana Government as follows:

<i>i) Minimum floor rate for urbanisable area of Gurgaon</i>	<i>Rs. 15.00 lacs per acre</i>
<i>ii) Minimum floor rate for rest of the Haryana Sub-Region of NCR including Panchkula and area of Chandigarh periphery in the Haryana State.</i>	<i>Rs.12.50 lacs per acre.</i>
<i>iii) Minimum floor rate for the rest of the Haryana State.</i>	<i>Rs.05.00 lacs per acre.</i>

(These floor rates did not include the solatium and interest payable under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894). 2. Now it has been observed that with the passage of time market rates of the land have increased substantially. Therefore, Haryana Government has reconsidered this matter and has decided to re-fix these floor rates as follows:

<i>i) Minimum floor rate for urbanisable area of Gurgaon.</i>	<i>Rs. 20.00 lacs per acre</i>
<i>ii) Minimum floor rate for rest of the Haryana Sub-Region of NCR including Panchkula and area of Chandigarh periphery in the Haryana State.</i>	<i>Rs.16.00 lacs per acre.</i>
<i>iii) Minimum floor rate for the rest of the Haryana State.</i>	<i>Rs. 08.00 lacs per acre.</i>

3. These floor rates do not include the solatium and interest payable under the provisions of the

Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

4. These revised rates will be applicable on all those acquisitions where awards have been announced on or after 22.3.2007 irrespective of the date of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894."

8.20 *It has also been noticed that the Reference Court while deciding the cases of the villages Daboda Khurd and various other villages in District Jhajjar, the Reference Court relied upon such policy decision and the State did not assail the correctness of the aforesaid finding. This Court has decided the aforesaid appeals on 05.10.2021. In that case also the acquisition of land was for the same purpose i.e constructing Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway. Furthermore, a coordinate Bench while deciding the appeals in **Om Parkash and others vs. State of Haryana and others** in RFA-7450-2011 and connected cases decided on 30.03.2012 took a view that the State has recognized the enhancement of the land's market value over the period of time due to various contributing factors, the prices of the land have been increasing. The Court after calculating the difference of Rs.3,50,000/- from 05.03.2005 and 22.03.2007, calculated proportionate per day increase and appropriately tweaked the market value. This Bench is in respectful agreement with the aforesaid view. In the present case, the increase in the market value per day comes to Rs.469.79 per day. There is a huge difference of 430 days from 05.03.2005. Thus, the additional amount works out to Rs.2,02,009.70 which is rounded to Rs.2,02,010/-. As in this case the award was passed on 10.05.2006 accordingly, taking the proportionate increase the amount as the market value works out to Rs.14,52,010/- per acre."*

Accordingly, the issue No.2 has been meticulously answered in the aforesaid reproduction.

ISSUE NO.3

8. As regards the claim of the landowners for damages on account of severance of their remaining/unacquired land into two different parcels due to compulsory acquisition of land in a narrow strip, the matter has already been discussed at length in **HSI IDC Vs. Om Dutt and Ors. RFA-**

421/2021, decided on 07.10.2021. In this case also, this Court was called upon to examine the issue of severance charges arising from the acquisition of land under the same notification issued for the same purpose. The relevant discussion is extracted as under:-

8.14 The next argument of the learned counsel representing the owners is with regard to damages for severance/splitting of the unacquired land in two parcels. It may be noted here that the land owners have not produced any evidence to prove the extent of land left on one side of the road as compared to the other side of the road. The owners may have suffered a loss due to splitting of their remaining unacquired land, however, in the absence of proper evidence to prove the extent of unacquired land which stands split up on both the sides of road and to what extent they have suffered a loss, it becomes very difficult for the court to assess the damages on account of severance. Unequivocally, Section 23 of the 1894 Act recognizes and permits the court to grant damages sustained by the person interested by reason of severance of such land from his other land. In the aforesaid situation, ordinarily this Court might have remitted the matter back to the Reference Court, however, keeping in view the fact that matter has already been once remitted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is considered appropriate to use thumb rule and assess the damages on account of severance of the land on the basis of precedents. Recently, while deciding appeals arising from acquisition of land for KMP Expressway from villages Daboda Khurd and others (RFA-5620-2013 titled as HSIIDC vs. Rattan Singh and others decided on 05.10.2021) this Court after noticing that the Reference Court awarded 20% of the acquired or un-acquired land, whichever is less, as damages for severance of the land, upheld the aforesaid view. In the cases arising from acquisition of land in one of the villages i.e Daboda Khurd, HSIIDC did not file any appeal.

8.15 Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, it is declared that if on account of acquisition of a land the remaining land holding of the landowner has been split into two or more parts, then the landowners shall be entitled to 20% of the smaller parcel of un-acquired land. However, the damages for severance shall be restricted only to those owners who are left with less than 5 acres land in the smaller parcel. This assumption has been made, particularly, in view of the fact that due to splitting of the

land, the landowner will have to not only cultivate his land in two independent parcels but also make a provision for irrigation of the land located in each parcel of land. Even the agricultural implements have to be carried to the other side of the road by going through underpasses, which may be at a distance. If a owner is left with a very small parcel of land, he may be forced to indulge in distress sale thereof.

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the appeals filed by the landowners are partly allowed and the market value of the acquired land is increased to Rs.14,52,010/- per acre. In other words, the market value is increased by Rs.2,02,010/- per acre. The landowners shall be entitled to the increased amount along with all the statutory benefits as per the amended act of 1894. The landowners shall also be entitled to 20% of the market value assessed by the Court for smaller parcel of the unacquired land left with the owner, if due to the compulsory acquisition, the remaining land holding left with the landowners has been split into two or more parts. However, the damages for severance shall be restricted only for those owners who are left with less than 5 acres of land in smaller parcels.

10. Consequently, the appeals filed by the landowners are partly allowed.

11. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

17th November, 2021

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Ay

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

1.	RFA-3850-2018	MOTI RAM (DECEASED) THROUGH LR & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
2.	RFA-3849-2018	KAPIL MOHAN & OTHERS V/S STATE

		OF HARYANA & OTHERS
3.	RFA-3851-2018	JUGAL KISHORE DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
4.	RFA-722-2020	HAR NARAYAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-547-2020	SHIVJIT AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
6.	RFA-490-2020	SHER SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
7.	RFA-543-2020	RAM SARUP V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-539-2020	RAM PAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-540-2020	DHARAMPAL (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
10.	RFA-764-2020	SH. RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
11.	RFA-571-2020	RAM CHADNER (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-765-2020	VIRENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
13.	RFA-544-2020	RAM PHAL V/S MANAGING DIRECTOR HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD AND OTHERS
14.	RFA-545-2020	DHARAM PAL AND OTHERS V/S HARYANA STATE THROUGH THE COLLECTOR GURGAON AND OTHERS
15.	RFA-542-2020	BALBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
16.	RFA-546-2020	ANIL KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
17.	RFA-541-2020	ATTAR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S HARYANA STATE THROUGH COLLECTOR GURGAON AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-1005-2020	KHEM RAM AND OTHERS V/S HARYANA STATE AND OTHERS

19.	RFA-1026-2020	SMT. SARITA DEVI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-1017-2020	AZAD SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-985-2020	SIRI KISHAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
22.	RFA-1027-2020	KUSHMA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-841-2021	JAGDISH CHAND AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
24.	RFA-811-2021	SHYAM KISHORE V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
25.	RFA-928-2020	KALI RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-980-2020	BHAGIRATH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-903-2020	MED SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-889-2020	UDDAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
29.	RFA-828-2021	BHAGWAT PARSAD (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
30.	RFA-1023-2020	ROHTASH AND OTHERS V/S HARYANA STATE AND OTHERS
31.	RFA-1011-2020	OM PARKASH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
32.	RFA-1029-2020	SMT. PREMWATI V/S HARYANA STATE AND OTHERS
33.	RFA-813-2021	BALJEET SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
34.	RFA-832-2021	BHARAT SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**