In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 1350 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.11.2021

Haryana State Industrial Development Corporation (Now Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited)

… Appellant(s)

Versus

Sultan Singh and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Ashwani Kumar Chopra, Senior Advocate with Mr. Pritam Singh Saini and Mr. Vidul Kapoor, Advocates for the HSIIDC.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran and Mr. Amit Jain, Advocates for the appellants (In RFA-173-2020) and for the respondents (In RFA-1368-2019).

Mr. Ajay Jain, Advocate for the respondents (In RFA-1376-2019 and XOBJR-37-2019).

Mr. Gulshan Nandwani, Advocate for the appellants (In RFA-1265 to 1267, 1291, 1308 to 1315, 1403 to 1406. 1627, 1669, 1671, 1672, 1794, 1795, 1927 to 1929, 2017, 2089, 2896 and 2990 of 2019) and for the respondents (In RFA-1353 to 1355, 1358, 1359, 1361, 1363, 1365 to 1367, 1369 to 1373, 1377, 1378, 1380 to 1382, 1384, 1388 to 1392, 1394, 1396 and 1400 to 1402 of 2019).

Mr. Sahil Gupta, Advocate for the appellants (In RFA-1232-2019) and for the respondents (In RFA-1399-2019).

Mr. Sanjay Vashisht and Mr. Akash Vashisht, Advocates for the appellant (In RFA-1208 and 1815 of 2019) and for the respondents (In RFA-1024-2019).

Mr. Sanjay Vij, Advocate for the landowners (In RFA1024 of 2019).

Mr. Jai Vir Yadav, Senior Advocate with Mr. Nitish Sharma, Advocate for the appellants (In RFA-3015 of 2019).

Mr. Atul Yadav, Advocate
for the appellants (In RFA-565 and 716 of 2019) and
for the respondents (In RFA-1357 and 1364 of 2019).

Mr. Ram Darshan Yadav, Advocate
for the appellants (In RFA-457 and 458 of 2019).

Mr. Nipun Vashisht, Advocate
for the appellants (In RFA-3482-2019, RFA-840-2020),
for the respondent No.1 (In RFA-1360-2019) and
for the respondent No.1 to 3 (In RFA-1385-2019).

Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the respondent and cross-objector (In RFA-1386-2019 and XOBJR-7-2020).

Mr. Chetan Salathia, Advocate.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. By this judgment, a batch of the regular first appeals/cross objections (details whereof are given on the foot of the judgment), filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as "the 1894 Act") assailing the correctness of the two awards passed by the Reference Court on 21.11.2018 and 06.11.2019, shall stand disposed of. The learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that these appeals as well as the cross-objections can be conveniently disposed of by a common judgment.

2. **FACTS**

2.1 The Reference Court, while deciding 52 reference applications under Section 18 of the 1894 Act on 21.11.2018, has increased the market value of the acquired land to ₹67,12,050/- per acre, uniformly with respect to all kinds of land located in village Malpura. By a separate award passed by the Reference Court on 06.11.2019, the market value of the acquired land located in village Malpura has been assessed @ ₹80,88,880/- per acre. The Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as "the LAC") had assessed the market value @ whereas ₹48,00,000/- per acre, for the land upto the depth of 2½ acres from the approach road and ₹50,00,000/- per acre, for the land upto the depth of 2½ acres from the National Highway –8 (Delhi-Jaipur Highway) and for the remaining land @ ₹40,00,000/- per acre, vide award No. 2 dated 10.05.2013. Before this Court proceeds with the matter, it is necessary to note the relevant particulars.

Date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act	13.05.2010
Date of Under Section 6 of the 1894 Act	12.05.2011
Land Acquisition Award No.2	10.05.2013 acquiring 1222 kanals 6 marlas of land which comes to 152 Acres, 6 Kanals & 6 Marlas

2.2 In order to utilize the land for the development of the Industrial Sector 15, 16 and 17, Dharuhera, the Government of Haryana had issued a notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 13.05.2010 proposing to acquire the land in various villages including the village Malpura. In the present batch of appeals, the cases relating to the village Malpura are being decided. The Government of Haryana acquired the land to develop an Integrated Complex for carrying out industrial and other public utility operations.

2.3 Feeling aggrieved against the proposed assessment of the market value, on the application of the landowners, the various cases were referred to the Reference Court. The landowners claimed that the market value of the acquired land is more than ₹5,00,00,000/- per acre, since, the acquired land is situated near the National Highway-8 (Delhi-Jaipur Highway). It has been asserted that a number of multinational industries like M/s Hero Honda Limited, M/s Ferus Infrastructures Private Limited, M/s Sony Limited, M/s Sehgal Papers Private Limited, M/s K.J. Private Limited and M/s Omaxe Private Limited have set up their industries and factories near the acquired land. Apart from the industries, various hotels, hospitals and petrol pumps are functioning in and around the acquired land from the period prior to the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The acquired land falls within the National Capital Region (hereinafter referred to as "the NCR"), therefore the LAC has not taken into consideration the potential as well as the prevalent market value of the acquired land while assessing the market value. The Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "the Corporation") filed its written statement refuting the stand taken by the landowners. It was claimed that the award passed by the LAC is just, fair and adequate, therefore, the reference applications should be dismissed.

2.4 From the pleadings, the following issues were framed by the Reference Court on 19.01.2017:-

> *"1. What was the market value of the acquired land on the date of notification No. 32/4/2010-4 IBI dated 13.05.2010 under Section 4 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894? OPP.*
>
> *2. Whether the petitions are time barred? OPR*
>
> *3. Relief".*

2.5 The landowners, in order to prove their case, examined Bharat Raj, Special Power of Attorney of the appellant-Raj Singh, Sunil Kumar Aggarwal, General Manager, Authorized Representative of M/s Besco Limited-Mahinder Singh, Vikash Rawat, Company Secretary, Authorized Representative of M/s Delton Cables Limited-Rajesh Goyal, Jagdish, Gautam Yadav, Authorized Representative of M/s Milestone Megastone Private Limited-Laxmi Narayan, Manpreet Singh, Krishan Lal, Chander Shekhar Sharma, Power of Attorney holder of the landowner-Brahm Dutt, who stepped into the witness box as PW,1, PW.2, PW.3, PW.4, PW.7, PW.9, PW.10/1, PW.11, PW.12, PW.13 and PW.14, respectively. Sunil Kumar, Registration Clerk, was examined as PW.5, whereas Narinder Gupta, Draftsman, appeared as PW.6. Another Draftsman Raj Pal Yadav was examined as PW.10, whereas Satyapal, Building Engineer, was examined as PW.14. In the case arising from the reference application, filed by M/s ARS Enterprises Private Limited, which was separately decided on 06.11.2019, the landowners have examined PW.1 Pranav Jain, PW.2 Ravinder Singh, Registration Clerk from the office of the Sub Registrar, Dharuhera, PW.3 Virender Singh, Clerk, in the office of District Town Planner, Rewari, PW.4 Nand Kumar Nagpal, approved Valuer and Assessor, PW.5 Om Parkash, Patwari of the area, Om Parkash, Patwari, was, once again, examined as PW.6. On the other hand, the HSIIDC examined Sh. Rajiv Goyal, Senior Manager (IA), HSIIDC, Dharuhera. The landowners also produced various documents including the comparable sale deeds to prove their case. On the other hand, the Corporation examined Rajiv Goyal, Senior Manager, HSIIDC, Dharuhera, as DW.1 and produced the layout plan and various sale deed exemplars.

2.6 The Reference Courts, as already noticed, reassessed the market value of the acquired land

2.7 It may be noted here that during the pendency of the appeal in ***BESCO Limited v. State of Haryana and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 1232 of 2019)***, an application for permission to lead additional evidence was filed. The appellant wishes to produce a certified copy of the sale deed dated 15.02.2010 with respect to the land measuring 5 kanals and 2 marlas situated in the village Malpura which was sold for a sum of **₹1,41,62,445/-**. The notice in the application was issued. The learned counsel representing the respondents have also filed their respective replies. The landowners also want to produce the application for permission to change the usage of the aforesaid land and site plans. On the notice issued, the respondents have filed their respective replies and after hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the aforesaid application was allowed. The sale deed is marked as Ex.PY. Whereas the applications for the change of land use and the site plan is marked as Ex.PZ and Ex.PZ/1. In ***M/s Mile Stone Mega City Private Limited and Others v. State of Haryana and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 173 of 2020)***, the landowners have also filed an application for permission to produce the additional evidence. The sale deed dated 15.02.2010 with respect to the land measuring 5 Kanals & 2 Marlas which has been sold for a total sale consideration of ₹1,41,62,445/- has been produced again. The sale deed has already been permitted to be produced in Regular First Appeal No. 1232 of 2019. For the same reasons, the appellant is also permitted to produce the aforesaid sale deeds. Apart therefrom, the appellant also seeks to produce on record the communication dated 11.02.2009 forwarded by the Director, Town and Country Planner, Haryana, to the appellant while granting permission to change the land use to construct a Warehouse at villages Kapriwas and Malpura. The appellant also wishes to produce a revised layout plan of Sector 15, 16 and 17 and the final development plan for the controlled area around Industrial Estate at Dharuhera. The layout plans are issued by the State. Hence, there can hardly be any doubt with respect to their genuineness. The learned counsel representing the Corporation states that he does not wish to lead any evidence in response to the additional evidence produced by the landowners.

2.8 Heard the learned counsel representing the parties and with their able assistance, perused the judgment passed by the Reference Court as well as the record which was requisitioned.

3. <u>ARGUMENTS OF THE LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES</u>

3.1 While opening the arguments on behalf of the landowners, Mr.Jaivir Yadav, Senior Advocate, contends that the village Malpura is located on the National Highway-8 (Delhi-Jaipur Highway) and many prominent industries have already set up their factories/units in the area of Malpura. While drawing the attention of the Court to Ex.P6/1, he submits that the Industrial Estate, Dharuhera, touches the south-western side and therefore, the market value of the acquired land cannot be assessed as per the market value of an agricultural land. He, further, while referring to the provisions of the Haryana Development and Regulations of Urban Areas Act, 1975 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1975 Act”) contends that the

Colonizers are entitled to recover the development charges from the plot holders. While criticizing the decision of the Reference Court to deduct 60% towards the development charges, he submits that the deduction on account of the development charges cannot be more than 10% and further submits that since there was a time gap of 21 months between the sale exemplar Ex.P4/3 and the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, as a result, the price should rather be increased by 10%. He has relied upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Chakas v. State of Punjab 2011(4) RCR (Civil) 211***.

3.2 Furthermore, Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, the learned counsel appearing for the landowners in Regular First Appeal No. 173 of 2020 has drawn the attention of the Court to the additional evidence while contending that the market value of the land on 13.05.2010 was not less than ₹2,00,00,000/- per acre. He submits that the land abutting the National Highway including the acquired land is of commercial nature and the landowners have already been granted permission to change the land usage. He further submits that the Reference Court has erred in assessing the market value of the land at a uniform rate as the nature of the land differs from one parcel to another.

3.3 On the other hand, the learned senior counsel representing the Corporation has contended that a Divisional Level Committee consisting of various high officials has assessed the market value of the acquired land on the basis of the material produced. He submits that the LAC has correctly assessed the market value. Moreover, while drawing the attention of the Court to Section 25 of the 1894 Act, the learned counsel representing the

Corporation contends that the Court misconstrued the provisions of Section 25 while ignoring the sale exemplars Ex.R1 to Ex.R8 produced by Corporation. He further contends that the sale deeds Ex.P2, Ex.P9/C, Ex.P9/D, Ex.P9/E. Ex.P9/F and Ex.PW.9/I which are with respect to the land located in some other villages have correctly been ignored by the Reference Court being two to four years prior to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. He further submits that the sale instances Ex.PW.5/1, Ex.PW.5/2 and Ex.PW.5/3 have rightly been ignored as these are with respect to the land located in other villages. Further, the sale deeds Ex.PW.5/4, Ex.PW.5/5, Ex.PW.5/6 and Ex.PW.5/7 have rightly been ignored as they relate to a smaller portion of the land measuring not more than 1 kanal. He has also submitted that the sale deed Ex.P1 is also liable to be ignored as it was executed after more than 2 years and 9 months from the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. He submits that the Reference Court has erred in applying only 60% development cut, whereas it should be 75%.

4. <u>ANALYSIS OF THE ARGUMENTS OF THE LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES</u>

4.1 In the present case, the acquisition is under the 1894 Act, which has recently been repealed by the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 2013 Act'). However, the assessment of the market value is required to be made as per the 1894 Act. Section 15 of the 1894 Act, provides that while determining the market value, the Collector shall be guided by the provisions contained in Section 23 and 24 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. Section 23 enlist the matters to be considered in determining the compensation. Clause 1 of sub-Section 1 of Section 23 provides that the market value of the acquired land is to be determined on the date of publication of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Section 24 of the 1894 Act enlist the matters to be ignored in determining the compensation. Hence, Section 23, 24 and 25 of the 1894 Act are extracted as under:-

> ***"23. Matters to be considered in determining compensation-***
>
> *(1) In determining the amount of compensation to be awarded for land acquired under this Act, the Court shall take into consideration—*
>
> *first the market-value of the land at the date of the publication of the notification under Section 4, sub-section (1).*
>
> *secondly the damage sustained by the person interested, by reason of the taking of any standing crops or trees which may be on the land at the time of the Collector's taking possession thereof;*
>
> *thirdly the damage (if any) sustained by the person interested, at the time of the Collector's taking possession of the land, by reason of severing such land from his other land;*
>
> *fourthly the damage (if any) sustained by the person interested, at the time of the Collector's taking possession of the land, by reason of the acquisition injuriously affecting his other property, movable or immovable, in any other manner, or his earnings;*

fifthly if, in consequence of the acquisition of the land by the Collector, the person interested is compelled to change his residence or place of business, the reasonable expenses (if any) incidental to such change, and

sixthly the damage (if any) bona fide resulting from diminution of the profits of the land between the time of the publication of the declaration under Section 6 and the time of the Collector's taking possession of the land.

(1-A) In addition to the market-value of the land, as above provided, the Court shall in every case award an amount calculated at the rate of twelve per centum per annum of such market-value for the period commencing on and from the date of the publication of the notification under Section 4, sub-section (1), in respect of such land to the date of the award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier.

Explanation.—In computing the period referred to in this sub-section, any period or periods during which the proceedings for the acquisition of the land were held up on account of any stay or injunction by the order of any court shall be excluded.

(2) In addition to the market-value of the land, as above provided, the Court shall in every case award a sum of[thirty per centum] on such market-value, in consideration of the compulsory nature of the acquisition.

24. Matters to be neglected in determining compensation

-But the Court shall not take into consideration—

first, the degree of urgency which has led to the acquisition;

secondly, any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired;

thirdly, any damage sustained by him, which, if caused by a private person, would not render such person liable to a suit;

fourthly, any damage which is likely to be caused to the land acquired, after the date of the publication of the declaration under Section 6, by or in consequence of the use to which it will be put;

fifthly, any increase to the value of the land acquired likely to accrue from the use to which it will be put when acquired;

sixthly, any increase to the value of the other land of the person interested likely to accrue from the use to which the land acquired will be put;

seventhly, any outlay or improvements on, or disposal of, the land acquired, commenced, made or effected without the sanction of the Collector after the date of the publication of the [notification under Section 4, sub-section (1); or

eighthly, any increase to the value of the land on account of its being put to any use which is forbidden by land or opposed to public policy.

***25. Amount of compensation awarded by court not to be lower than the amount award by the Collector -** The amount of compensation awarded by the Court shall not be less than the amount awarded by the Collector under Section 11."*

4.2 After having heard the learned counsel for the parties at length, now the stage is set for analyzing the same.

4.3 At this stage, it is appropriate to examine the correctness of the deduction of 60% ordered by the Reference Court while assessing the market value of the acquired land. The Reference Court has relied upon the sale exemplar (Ex.PW.4/3), which is with respect to the land measuring 12 Kanals & 2 Marlas sold for ₹2,16,00,000/- on 13.08.2013. The per acre price of this sale exemplar comes to ₹1,42,80,916/-. The Reference Court has deducted 60% from ₹1,42,80,916/- to arrive at a figure of ₹57,12,384/-.

4.4 Let us first examine the statutory provisions. It is clear that the Legislature never intended that the Court must apply a cut/deduction in each and every case. Rather, it has been laid down that while acquiring the land, the landowners, who stand deprived of the property against their wishes, shall be held entitled to a sum of 30% on such market value in lieu of the compulsory and involuntary nature of acquisition. In common legal parlance, this amount is called solatium. This part of the amount is in the nature of compensation to the owner for depriving him of his property without his consent.

4.5 This Bench has carefully surveyed/examined the various judgments passed by the courts from time to time providing for deduction or moderation of the market value. In ***Lal Chand vs. Union of India, (2009) 15 SCC 769***, the Court held that 'the deduction for development' consists of two components. The first component is with reference to the area required to be utilized for the development work. In other words, whenever the acquisition is for carrying out a developmental work like setting up a residential/commercial or industrial township in the area, then a certain part of the acquired land is required to be utilized for carving out passages, roads, drains, parks and other facilities. The second component for calculating such deduction is with regard to the cost of such development work to be carried out by the acquiring agency. Further, in ***Haridwar Development Authority vs. Raghbir Singh and others (2010) 11 SCC 581***, the Supreme Court held that when the market value of a large tract of agricultural land has to be determined with reference to a price fetched by the sale of a small residential plot, it is necessary to make appropriate deduction towards the development cost to arrive at an appropriate value for such large tracts of land. The court held that the deduction can range between 20% to 75% depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case.

4.6 In ***Shaji Kuriakose And Anr vs Indian Oil Corpn. Ltd. And Ors. (2001) 7 SCC 650***, the court held that in case of a dissimilarity in respect of locality, shape, size or value of the land between the land covered by the sale exemplar and the land acquired, the court can proportionately reduce the value. The court *inter-alia* noticed five factors to be applied while assessing a fair market value of the acquired land. The court further went on to hold that in a case where the sale exemplar satisfies all the factors, which are required to be fulfilled, then, there is no reason for not awarding the price similar to the market value as ascertained in the relevant sale deed exemplar. The relevant discussion is in para 3 which is extracted as under:-

> *"3. It is no doubt true that courts adopt comparable sales method of valuation of land while fixing the market value of the acquired land. While fixing the market value of the acquired*

land, comparable sales method of valuation is preferred than other methods of valuation of land such as capitalisation of net income method or expert opinion method. Comparable sales method of valuation is preferred because it furnishes the evidence for determination of the market value of the acquired land at which a willing purchaser would pay for the acquired land if it had been sold in the open market at the time of issue of notification under Section 4 of the Act. However, comparable sales method of valuation of land for fixing the market value of the acquired land is not always conclusive. There are certain factors which are required to be fulfilled and on fulfilment of those factors the compensation can be awarded, according to the value of the land reflected in the sales. The factors laid down inter alia are: (1) the sale must be a genuine transaction, (2) that the sale deed must have been executed at the time proximate to the date of issue of notification under Section 4 of the Act, (3) that the land covered by the sale must be in the vicinity of the acquired land, (4) that the land covered by the sales must be similar to the acquired land, and (5) that the size of plot of the land covered by the sales be comparable to the land acquired. If all these factors are satisfied, then there is no reason why the sale value of the land covered by the sales be not given for the acquired land. However, if there is a dissimilarity in regard to locality, shape, site or nature of land between land covered by sales and land acquired, it is open to *the court to proportionately reduce the compensation for acquired land than what is reflected in the sales depending upon the disadvantages attached with the acquired land. In the present case, what we find is that the first two factors are satisfied. The sale transaction covered by the sale Ext. A-4 is genuine, inasmuch as the sale was executed in proximity to the date of notification under Section 4 of the Act. However, there is a difference in the similarity in the land acquired and the land covered by Ext. A-4. The land covered by Ext. A-4 is situated at Kottayam and Ernakulam, PWD Road, whereas the acquired land is situated at a distance of 3 furlongs from the main road. There is no access to the acquired land and there exists only an internal mud road which belonged to one of the claimants, whose land has also been acquired. Further, the land covered by Ext. A-4 is a dry land and whereas the acquired land is a wetland. After acquisition, the acquired land has to be reclaimed and a lot of amount would be spent for filling the land. Moreover, the land covered by Ext. A-4 relates to a small piece of land which does not reflect the true market value of the acquired land. It is often seen that a sale for a smaller plot of land fetches more consideration than a larger or bigger piece of land. For all these reasons, the High Court was fully justified in lowering the rate of compensation than what was the market value of the land covered by Ext. A-4. We, therefore, do not find any infirmity in the judgment of the High*

Court.

4.7 The principle underlined by all these judgments is that while assessing the market value, the Court is required to apply a common man's wisdom and arrive at a figure which a willing seller will get from a voluntary purchaser for the property. Once the market value of the acquired agricultural land is being assessed and many sale exemplars of considerably big sized plots of the agricultural land are available, the application of cut/deduction for development, in the considered opinion of the Court, is not justified unless the court is assessing the market value of a land where the sale exemplars produced before the Court are of relatively small sized plots or are being used for residential, commercial or industrial purposes. The deduction can be applied when comparable sale exemplar is of a plot of a very small size as compared to the acquired land in order to moderate the difference between wholesale and retail prices as observed by the Supreme Court in judgment passed in ***LaL Chand's case*** *(supra)*. The appropriate percentage of cut can also be applied if the sale exemplar is of a plot which was being used or was capable of being used for different purposes like residential, commercial or industrial. The development cut can also be applied when the comparable sale exemplar is of a plot which is located at a key position like near the road, market, developed residential colony or commercial establishments. There can be more than one reason to apply the development cut. However, if the price is reduced while assessing the market value of the acquired land, without observing the aforesaid principles while making the deduction in the facts and circumstances of the individual cases, it shall be against the statutory intendment. In a case where the court is making an assessment with respect to an undeveloped acquired land in an undeveloped area and the sale exemplar produced for such determination is also of an undeveloped piece of land of reasonable size, then, any deduction which is made on account of development work or development cost, in the considered opinion of this Court, is not appropriate. This can be explained by an example. Hypothetically, if a farmer purchases a sufficiently large chunk of land just before the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. On the acquisition of the land purchased, he is likely to produce the sale exemplar of the land purchased by him. If the court treats the sale exemplar as the base value and thereafter, applies a cut or deduction on account of development cut or development cost, *per se*, he shall stand deprived of the market value paid by him while purchasing the land. It would be against the spirit/intention of the 1894 Act. While assessing the market value of the undeveloped/agricultural land, the court is not required to work out the market value of the developed land or plot. In such circumstances, the application of development cut, in the considered opinion of the Court, would neither be appropriate nor justified. The cut/deduction is applied by the courts in order to arrive at a correct figure representing the true market value of the acquired land on the relevant date. This method has been devised by the Courts in order to tide over the situations where exactly comparable sale exemplars of contemporaneous period are not available. The court, while making adjustments or treating the prices of the developed plots of smaller size as the base, endeavours to work out the fair market value of the acquired land.

4.8 This matter can be examined from another angle. The intention of the legislature is not to put the landowners who stand deprived of the land through double whammy. On the one hand, their immovable property is compulsorily taken away, whereas on the other hand, they are not being compensated adequately due to the deduction towards the development. This cannot be the intention of the legislature. The fundamental intention of the Legislature has always been to make the land laws fair, just and reasonable towards the sufferers of compulsory land acquisition.

4.9 Once a large chunk of agricultural land is being acquired for carving out a residential/commercial or industrial colony and the sale exemplars of plots of reasonable size of agricultural land are available, then in the considered opinion of this Court, it would not be appropriate to apply a development cut for the purpose of assessment either towards development cost or towards the area to be used for passages, roads, drains, parks etc. The landowner stands in the shoes of a loser even if some part of the acquired land is being used for providing common facilities. The landowner does not gain anything exclusively on account of reservation of land for common facilities. In fact, the landowner suffers a dual loss. On the one hand, he is deprived of the acquired land and on the other hand, he does not receive a fair and appropriate amount towards the involuntary deprivation.

4.10 There is yet another aspect of the matter. The development agency/organization/colonizer or the government do not sell the developed plots on the market value assessed by the court. The plots are sold while determining price on basis of the market forces. Usually, the plots are sold on the basis of price determined on per sq. feet or per sq. yard. basis. Therefore, certain percentage of land utilized for carrying out development activities like passages, roads, drains, parks etc. is to be accounted for by the developer and not by the landowner. Therefore, in the considered view of this Court, the development cost incurred or to be incurred for providing common facilities is also required to be borne by the developer.

4.11 It is well settled that while assessing the market value, the court is required to adopt a pragmatic approach. The landowners who stand deprived of the property cannot be permitted to be denied of an adequate and just compensation as well. This is the responsibility of the courts to see that the landowners are adequately compensated. The learned counsel representing the parties have failed to draw the attention of the court to any precedent which lays down that while assessing the market value, the application of development cut or deduction on the base value is mandatory.

4.12 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, it is evident that the Reference Court has committed an error in deducting 60% from the sale exemplar produced by the landowners and relied upon by it.

4.13 At this stage, it would be appropriate to extract the sale exemplars produced by both the parties, which is extracted as under:-

Sr. No.	**Exhibit No.**	**Date of Sale Deed**	**Area**	**Land calculated in marlas**	**Total Price (In ₹)**	**Price Per Acre (In ₹)**	**Village**	**Type of Land**
1.	PW.4/3	13.08.2008	1A-4K-2M	242	2,16,00,000	1,42,80,991	Malpura	Chahi
2.	PW.5/3	23.11.2009	250 Square Yards	8.33	15,75,000	3,02,52,100	Dharuhera	Commercial
3.	PW.5/4	16.11.2009	1K-13M	33	60,00,000	2,90,90,909	Dharuhera	Chahi
4.	PW.5/5	02.12.2009	358.6 Square Yards	11.95	22,60,440	3,02,65,305	Dharuhera	Residential
5.	PW.5/6	20.04.2010	1M	1	3,00,000	4,80,00,000	Dharuhera	Chahi
6.	PW.5/7	27.04.2010	366.275 Square Yards	12.20	24,17,500	3,17,04,918	Dharuhera	Residential
7.	PW.9/C	26.05.2006	6K-19M	139	82,53,125	95,00,000	Ghandhi Alawalpur	Chahi
8.	PW.9/E	29.05.2006	3A-1K-8M	508	3,01,62,500	95,00,000	Ghandhi Alawalpur	Chahi
9.	PW.9/F	08.06.2006	2K-16.5M	56.5	33,54,700	95,00,035	Ghandhi Alawalpur	Chahi
10.	PW.9/D	26.05.2006	3A-4K-13M	573	3,40,21,875	95,00,000	Ghandhi	Chahi

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Date of Sale Deed	Area	Land calculated in marlas	Total Price (In ₹)	Price Per Acre (In ₹)	Village	Type of Land
							Alawalpur	
11.	PW.2/c PW.4/2 PW.9/J	12.01.2012	1A	160	5,00,00,000	5,00,00,000	Maheshwari	Chahi
12.	PW.9/I	08.01.2007	11A-4K-7M	1847	16,16,12,500	1,40,00,000	Ghandhi Alawalpur	Chahi
13,	PW.5/1	20.07.2009	Not Mentioned	--	7,00,01,000	--	Dharuhera	--
14.	PW.5/2	21.08.2009	41167 Square Yards	1372.23	16,80,00,000	1,95,88,552	Dharuhera	Commercial
15.	P-1 P-7	18.02.2013	2K-2M	42	1,00,00,000	3,80,95,238	Malpura	Chahi
16.	P-2	19.06.2008	6K-19M	139	90,35,000	1,04,00,000	Kapriwas	Chahi
17.	R-1	09.04.2009	<u>3A-7K-7M</u> 17//14/2, 15/2, 16/2, 17, 18,19/1	627	80,00,000	20,41,467	Malpura	Chahi
18.	R-2	29.11.2010	<u>4K-7M</u> 30/1 & 31/5	87	9,52,000	17,50,804	Malpura	Chahi
19.	R-3	09.03.2010	<u>1A-3K-19M</u> 14//22, 16//1, 2/1 Khasra No. 191	239	25,30,000	16,93,723	Malpura	Chahi
20.	R-4	29.11.2010	<u>5K</u> 30/1 & 31/5	100	10,94,000	17,50,400	Malpura	Chahi
21.	R-5	02.02.2011	<u>7K-4M</u> 30/1 & 31/5	144	15,75,000	17,50,000	Malpura	Chahi
22.	R-6	10.11.2010	<u>2A-5K-11M</u> 56//19/1, 19/2, 23, 5/1, 14, 17/2, 24/1	431	67,19,000	24,94,292	Malpura	Chahi
23.	R-7	21.02.2011	<u>2A-7K-8M</u> 4//21, 3//25, 24, 23/1	468	1,10,09,250	37,63,846	Malpura	Chahi
24.	R-8	09.11.2009	1A 12//12, 13, 14, 17/1, 18/1, 19/1	160	15,75,000	15,75,000	Malpura	Chahi
25.	PY	15.02.2010	<u>5K-2M</u> 19//4/4, 7/1	102	1,42,62,445	2,23,72,463	Malpura	Chahi

4.13 In order to understand the information compiled in above-noted table, it is appropriate to explain the meaning of the words/phrases/expressions used, as under:-

1.	1 Rectangle	=	5 X 5 = 25 Acre
2.	1 Acre	=	160 Marlas
3.	8 Kanal	=	1 Acre
4.	1 Kanal	=	20 Marlas
5.	1 Acre	=	4840 Sq. Yards
6.	1 Marla	=	272.251 Sq. Feet = 30.25 Sq. Yards
7.	1 Inch	=	2.54 cm
8.	1 Foot	=	12 Inch.
9.	1 Sq. Feet	=	12 X 12 =144 Inch.

10.	1 Yard	=	3 Feet
11.	1 Sq. Yard	=	9 Sq. Feet
12.	100 Sq. Yards	=	900 Sq. Feet
13.	1 Kanal	=	0.125 Acre
14.	1 Marla	=	0.00625001 Acre
15.	"//" denotes Rectangle Number.		
16.	"/" denotes Khasra/Killa Number.		

Note:-

The expression "Rectangle" in terms of size of the land denotes an area of 25 acres (5 X 5 acres) in a rectangular shape. During the consolidation of land holdings under the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948, each plot of 25 acres is assigned a rectangle number in ascending order starting from the north-eastern boundary of the village towards the south-eastern boundary of the village, then, while coming to the next strip of 5 acres of land towards the western side of the previous strip, the rectangle number increases from the south-eastern side to north-eastern side i.e. in the reverse direction.

4.14 At this stage, it would be more appropriate to carefully study the layout plan produced by the HSIIDC (Ex.P12). This is an integrated shijra plan showing the revenue estate of villages Kapdiwas, Gadhi Alawalpur, Malpura and Ghatal Mahniyawas. It is evident that the National Highway (Delhi-Jaipur Road) is bisecting the land of villages Kapdiwas and Malpura on both the sides of the road. The National Highway is passing from the north-eastern direction to south-western direction in the territory of villages Kapdiwas and Malpura. The residential area of village Kapdiwas as well as Malpura are towards the western side of the road whereas the acquired land is towards the eastern side of the National Highway. The acquired land is in the shape of a compact lock along the National Highway.

The depth of the acquired land along the National Highway in village Kapdiwas is approximately 20 acres, whereas it reduces to only 10 acres in village Malpura. It is also evident that there is a road from the territory of village Kapdiwas which goes across the acquired land. It is the case of the landowners that this land has been carved out in order to give access to the vehicles to the Industrial Area, Bhiwadi (Rajasthan).

4.15 The Reference Court has assessed the market value of the land, while relying upon the sale exemplar (Ex.P4/3) which is with respect to 12 Kanals & 2 Marlas of land sold for ₹2,16,00,000/- on 13.08.2008. The per acre price comes to ₹1,42, 80,916/-. Thereafter, the Reference Court deducted 60% from ₹1,42, 80,916/- on the ground that a substantial part of the land will have to be utilized for roads, passengers and drains etc. and expenditure on development cost. Thus, the Reference Court has arrived at a figure of ₹57,12,384/- as in August 2008. Thereafter, the Reference Court granted an increase @ 10% per annum with regard to the time gap between 13.08.2008 to 13.05.2010 (the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act). The Reference Court, thus, arrived at a figure of ₹67,12,047/-. In the considered view of this Court, once the land measuring 12 Kanals & 2 Marlas, which is more than 1½ acre, located across the National Highway (the eastern side of the National Highway) has been sold @ ₹ 1,42,80,916/- per acre, then, it was not appropriate for the Reference Court to apply 60% cut. One and a half acre of land is not a small area of land. Further, the acquired land cannot be said to be used only for agricultural purposes particularly when the companies have started purchasing the same. In fact, Delta Cables Limited has purchased the land measuring 12 Kanals & 2

Marlas.

4.16 From a careful perusal of the layout plan (Ex.R12) along with the sale deeds, it becomes evident that the sale instance (Ex.P2) is with respect to the land measuring 6 Kanals & 19 Marlas. This is with respect to the land comprised in rectangle No. 49, 50, 51 and 52, located in village Kapdiwas, which has also been acquired under the same notification. The layout plan clearly shows that the aforesaid parcel of land is abutting the boundary of village Malpura. In fact, there is no physical boundary between the villages. It is only a notional/fictional boundary so as to identify the land located in different villages. Furthermore, it is evident that in village Malpura, the land abutting the Delhi-Jaipur Highway upto the depth of approximately 10 acres has been acquired. It is significant to note that the land in village Malpura was sold @ ₹ 1,42,80,991/- per acre vide a sale deed dated 13.08.2008 (Ex.PW.4/3). However, this parcel of the land is comprised in rectangle No. 29 and khasra No. 4 & 5, which is on the other side (western side) i.e. across the National Highway-8. Although this parcel of land is not comparable, however, it corroborates Ex.P2 with respect to the market value of the acquired land. Moreover, in additional evidence, the landowners have produced the sale instance dated 15.02.2010 with respect to the land measuring 5 Kanals & 2 Marlas sold @ ₹ 2,23,72,463/- per acre. This parcel of the land is also located on the western side of the National Highway-8 and at some distance from the acquired land.

4.17 Since the most appropriate sale exemplar appears to be Ex.P2, which is not only abutting the acquired land but also forms a part of the acquired land, therefore, it is safe to rely upon the same. However, the sale instance is of 19.06.2008, whereas the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued on 13.05.2010. The Court is required to determine the market value of the acquired land as on 13.05.2010. From a careful perusal of the sale exemplar (Ex.PW4/3) and the sale deed produced in additional evidence (Ex.PY), it becomes evident that the price of the land was increasing quite rapidly. The location of the acquired land is prime. In fact, the Industrial Estate of Dharuhera has already been developed and a lot of builders/developers/industrialists have already started purchasing the properties in and around the Industrial Estate of Dharuhera. Hence, it will be safe to assume that the market value of the land was increasing @ 10% per annum. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts, the amount arrived at comes to ₹1,21,33,320/- per acre. The Court is expected to take a pragmatic view while assessing the market value, particularly when the parcel of land covered by Ex.P2, although situated in village Kapdiwas, is abutting the acquired land of village Malpura. The land sold through Ex.P2 has also been acquired. Hence, the market value of the land is assessed at ₹1,21,33,320/- per acre.

4.18 Now let us examine the sale exemplar, produced by the HSIIDC. Ex.R1 is with respect to the sale executed on 09.04.2009 out of the land comprised in Rectangle No.17. This rectangle is located on the western side far away from the road. It is even behind the abadi of residential area of village Malpura which is abutting the National Highway-8. Hence, the same cannot be relied upon. Ex.R2 is a sale instance of the land comprised in Rectangle No. 30 and 31. The position of the aforesaid parcels of land is also similar to the position of Ex.R1. The next sale exemplar is Ex.R3 which is for the sale of land out of Rectangle No. 14 and 15. This parcel of land is on the extreme western boundary of village Malpura and is at least at a distance of 30 Acres from the National Highway. Therefore, the same can also not be relied upon. The position of the sale instances Ex.R4 and Ex.R5 is similar to Ex.R2. The sale instance Ex.R6 is with respect to the sale of land out of Rectangle No. 56. This sale instance is with respect to the land towards the western side of the National Highway-8 at a distance of 6 Acres from the road. As regards the sale instance Ex.R8, it is apparent that the land has been sold out of Rectangle No. 12 which is towards the eastern side of the National Highway-8 and at a distance of approximately 15 acres. Undoubtedly Ex.R7 (21.02.2011) is a sale deed which is out of the land comprised in Rectangle No. 3 and 4 abutting the National Highway-8. From a careful reading of the sale deed, it is clear that 13 Kanals of land is on the National Highway-8, whereas the land measuring 9 Kanals & 11 Marlas is on the back side. This is on the western side of the National Highway-8 and since the acquisition is towards the eastern side, therefore, it would not be appropriate to rely upon the same particularly when the sale deed of eastern side is available. It is significant to note that while subsequently deciding, the LAC/14 of 2019 (M/s ARS Enterprises Private Limited v. State of Haryana), the Reference Court itself has assessed the market value of the acquired land located in village Malpura @ ₹80,08,880/- while relying upon the assessment made with respect to the land located in village Kapdiwas. The appeal filed by M/s ARS Enterprises Private Limited is also being disposed of along with the bunch.

4.19 M/s ARS Enterprises Private Limited has also claimed the amount with regard to the structure. The appellant claims that industrial unit with 70000 square feet covered area under the name of M/s Utility Engineers (India) Limited was functioning from the premises at the time of acquisition. The company examined the Valuer who has assessed the cost of structure @ ₹2,63,60,000/-. Whereas the HSIIDC has examined Sh.P.C.Jain as RW.3, who has assessed the cost of structure @ ₹1,75,74,429/-. The Reference Court has assessed the amount of compensation on account of structure @ ₹2,05,00,00/-. The learned counsel representing the appellant contends that the report (Ex.P15) prepared by PW.4 Sh. Nand Kumar Nagpal, Valuer, has been wrongly ignored. It is noted here that the Valuer only gives an opinion which can be critically appraised by the Presiding Judge of the Court. The Reference Court has given cogent reasons to assess the market value of the structure keeping in view its age. Furthermore, the appellant has not produced its account books to prove the amount spent on the strucutre. In such circumstances, this Bench does not find it appropriate to interfere with the aforesaid assessment made by the LAC. It is noted here that in ***Om Parkash Goel's case*** *(supra)* also, the amount for the structure was claimed. The Court, after examining the evidence, has assessed ₹3,06,850/-. As in this case, there was a boundary wall having length 633 meters along with a hut for Chowkidar. No significant argument was addressed at the time of arguments. Hence, there is no scope for further enhancement. Similarly, in ***Krishan Lal v. State of Haryana***, the compensation for the structure has been claimed. The approved Valuer, in his valuation report, has reported that the farm house was inspected on 01.09.2016. The Court found that the construction is spread over in the area of 14 Kanals & 16 Marlas and consists of boundary wall, iron gate, two RCC pillars and one Guard Room. The Reference Court has given cogent reasons to assess the compensation @ ₹3,74,600/- for the structure which, jointly, belonged to Ashwani Jain, Ram Bilas Goyal, Manpreet Singh and Sarju Kumar, to be paid to them to the extent of their respective share. The learned counsel representing the aforesaid owners did not draw the attention of the Court to any error in the aforesaid finding of the Reference Court. Moreover, these persons have not produced any evidence to prove the amount spent while constructing the above said structure (farmhouse).

5. <u>INFERENCE:</u>

5.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the appeals, filed by the landowners, are allowed, while declaring that they shall be entitled to the market value of the acquired land in village Malpura @ ₹1,21,33,320/- per acre, along with all the statutory benefits as per the amended Land Acquisition Act, 1894, whereas, the various appeals, filed by the HSIIDC, are ordered to be dismissed.

5.2 The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, in the appeals shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

November 02, 2021
"DK"

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

1.	RFA-1359-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAJA REDDY AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-1239-2019	M/S DELTON CABLES LIMITED V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
3.	XOBJR-7-2020	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S BHRAM DUTT AND OTHERS

4.	RFA-1363-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SMT. PREMLATA AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-1356-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAJ SINGH AND OTHERS
6.	RFA-1671-2019	INDRA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
7.	RFA-1388-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAJENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-1309-2019	KARAN SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-1394-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S INDRA AND OTHERS
10.	RFA-1366-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAMBILAS GOEL AND OTHERS
11.	RFA-2089-2019	RAMBAKSH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-1395-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SH. KISHAN LAL AND OTHERS
13.	RFA-1372-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S PURAN CHAND AND OTHERS
14.	RFA-2017-2019	LAXMAN SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
15.	RFA-1353-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SURESH AND OTHERS
16.	RFA-1405-2019	RAJA REDDY AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
17.	RFA-457-2019	SURENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-1360-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S LUXMINARAIN AND OTHER
19.	RFA-1364-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S MAHESH AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-1312-2019	MANPREET SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-1377-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAKESH AND OTHERS
22.	RFA-1315-2019	VIJAY PAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-1383-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S RADHIKA AND OTHERS
24.	RFA-1795-2019	SATYAPAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
25.	RFA-1396-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S KARAN SINGH AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-565-2019	DIGH RAM DECEASED THROUGH ITS LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-1794-2019	ASHOK AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-1351-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SMT. PREM B. DATTA AND OTHERS
29.	RFA-1352-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

		CORPORATION V/S LOKESH AND OTHERS
30.	RFA-458-2019	RAMESH KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
31.	RFA-1311-2019	OM PARKASH GOYAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
32.	RFA-1314-2019	RAJ SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
33.	RFA-1627-2019	RAJE RAM (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
34.	RFA-1357-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S DIGH RAM AND OTHERS
35.	RFA-1404-2019	RAJENDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
36.	RFA-716-2019	MAHESH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
37.	RFA-1929-2019	RAMNIWAS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
38.	RFA-1232-2019	BESCO LTD. (FORMERLY BHARTIA ELECTRIC STEEL CO. LTD) V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
39.	RFA-1024-2019	MAHENDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH COLLECTOR AND OTHERS
40.	RFA-1308-2019	SMT. PREMLATA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
41.	RFA-1310-2019	SARJU @ SURAJ V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER
42.	RFA-1370-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SARJU @ SURAJ AND OTHERS
43.	RFA-1373-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S HUKAM SINGH @ HUKAM CHAND AND OTHERS
44.	RFA-1266-2019	JAIPAL AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
45.	RFA-1376-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S ISHWAR AND OTHERS
46.	RFA-1354-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAJ SINGH AND ANOTHER
47.	RFA-1378-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAM NATH AND OTHERS
48.	RFA-1393-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S MAHENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
49.	RFA-1362-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAMESH KUMAR AND OTHERS
50.	RFA-1369-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SURAJBHAN AND OTHERS
51.	RFA-1265-2019	HUKAM SINGH @ HUKAM CHAND V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
52.	RFA-1267-2019	RAM SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
53.	RFA-1390-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAMNIWAS AND OTHERS
54.	RFA-1208-2019	RAVINDER KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH COLLECTOR REWARI AND OTHERS
55.	RFA-1296-2019	BANWARI LAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

56.	RFA-1291-2019	HARI SINGH AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
57.	RFA-1374-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAVINDER KUMAR AND OTHERS
58.	RFA-1379-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S DEEN DAYAL AND OTHERS
59.	RFA-1625-2019	RAMBILAS GOEL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
60.	RFA-1392-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S VIJAY PAL AND OTHERS
61.	RFA-1380-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAM SINGH AND OTHERS
62.	RFA-1355-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S LAXMAN SINGH AND OTHERS
63.	RFA-1382-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SHRI RAM AND OTHERS
64.	RFA-1385-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S GORAV (MINOR) AND OTHERS
65.	RFA-1387-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SURENDER SINGH AND ANOTHER
66.	RFA-1397-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S M/S GPC TECHNOLOGY LTD AND OTHERS
67.	RFA-1406-2019	RANDHIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
68.	RFA-1384-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAMBAKSH AND OTHERS
69.	RFA-1386-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S BHRAM DUTT AND OTHERS
70.	RFA-1389-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S ASHOK AND OTHERS
71.	RFA-1391-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S HARI SINGH AND OTHERS
72.	RFA-1400-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S OM PARKASH GOYAL AND OTHERS
73.	RFA-1669-2019	RAKESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
74.	RFA-1358-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S MANPREET SINGH AND OTHERS
75.	RFA-1313-2019	RAJENDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
76.	RFA-1927-2019	PURAN CHAND AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
77.	RFA-1928-2019	SURESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
78.	RFA-1815-2019	M/S HABITAT ESTATES PVT LTD V/S STATE OF

		HARYANA AND OTHERS
79.	RFA-1672-2019	RAM NATH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
80.	RFA-1375-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S M/S DELTON CABLES LTD. AND OTHERS
81.	RFA-1402-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S JAIPAL AND OTHERS
82.	RFA-1403-2019	SURAJBHAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
83.	RFA-1371-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S ASHWANI KUMAR JAIN AND OTHERS
84.	RFA-1361-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S SATYAPAL JAIN AND OTHERS
85.	RFA-1365-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RANDHIR SINGH AND OTHERS
86.	RFA-1401-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S BANWARI LAL AND OTHERS
87.	RFA-1381-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAJENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
88.	RFA-1398-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S M/S HABITAT ESTATES PVT. LTD. AND OTHERS
89.	RFA-1399-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S BESCO LIMITED AND OTHERS
90.	RFA-1368-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S M/S MILE STONE MEGA CITY PVT LTD AND OTHERS
91.	RFA-1367-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S RAJE RAM AND OTHERS
92.	RFA-173-2020	M/S MILE STONE MEGA CITY PVT. LTD. AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
93.	RFA-2896-2019	SHRI RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
94.	RFA-3482-2019	LAXMI NARAYAN V/S HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND OTHERS
95.	RFA-2990-2019	ASHWANI KUMAR JAIN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
96.	RFA-3015-2019	RAJ SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
97.	RFA-840-2020	GAURAV AND OTHERS (MINORS) THROUGH THEIR FATHER JAGDISH V/S HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL

		DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND OTHERS
98.	XOBJR-37-2019	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION V/S ISWAR AND OTHERS