

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**RFA-641-2021(O&M)
Date of Order: 29.11.2021**

**HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED**

..Appellant

Versus

SURESH AND OTHERS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANILKSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Baldev Raj Mahajan, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. P.S. Saini, Advocate
for the HSIIDC.

Mr. Ashwani Gaur, Advocate
for the appellants (in RFA-807 and 808 of 2021)

Mr. Pawan Kumar Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Surya Kumar, Advocate
and Ms. Seema Rani, Advocate
for the appellants (in RFA-809, 812, 815, 816, 817, 818, 2062
and 2063 of 2021)

Mr. Gaurav Aggarwal, Advocate
for the appellants (in RFA-911-2021)

Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate
for the landowner (in RFA-814-2021)

Mr. Harkesh Manuja, Advocate.

Ms. Vibha Tewari, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

By this order a bunch of 33 appeals, (details whereof are on the
foot of the judgment), shall stand disposed of.

1. Through this batch of appeals filed under Section 54 of the
Land Acquisition Act, 1894, (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act'), the
Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation

Limited (hereinafter referred to as 'HSI IDC') (the beneficiary of the acquisition) as well as the landowners who stand deprived of their land due to the compulsory acquisition, located in Village Kasan assail the correctness of a common award dated 10.01.2020 passed by the Reference Court while deciding 50 Reference petitions filed under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. HSI IDC prays for the reduction of the assessed market value of the acquired land whereas the landowners pray for enhancement thereof. The learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that these 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 an assessment of the market value of the different parcels of acquired land in the village in question made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court acquired previously under a different notification, is binding while making an assessment of the market value of different parcels of land in the same village acquired subsequently, while ignoring the comparable sale exemplar of the acquired land and the nearby parcels of land, which are available and have been produced and proved in the evidence, for the contemporaneous period?*

2. *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?*
3. *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?*
4. *Whether the Court is required to assess the severance damages suffered by the landowners on account of bifurcation of their unacquired 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 1, 3 and 4 involves common questions which have been, comprehensively, answered in the previous judgments arising from the same notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The aforesaid issues have been discussed, after examining issue No.2.

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 the 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.20 was announced on 10.05.2006 with respect to the acquired land located in Village Dhana. 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 29.08.2012 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 redetermined the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.37,04,277/- per acre.

3.2 The Reference Court, on appreciation of 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. ORAL EVIDENCE

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

- “1. PW1 Puran, one of the landowners;
2. PW2 Ram Pal, another landowners. He is the son of Sh. Bodan, who has purchased land measuring 5 kanals and 4 marlas vide sale deed dated 04.10.2004, Ex.R6/R10;

After the remand of the case by the Supreme Court, the owners examined:-

3. PW3 Pawan Kumar;
4. PW4 Jagdish, Assistant Craftsman from the Office of DTP, Gurugram;
5. PW5 Sat Narain, Draftsman from the Office of DTP, HSIIDC, IMT, Manesar, Gurugram;
6. PW6 Vineet Malik, Assistant Manager, HSIIDC, IMT, Manesar, Gurugram, and,
7. PW7 Bijender Kumar, Patwari of Village Dhana, PW8 Gaurav Arora, Assistant Manager, HSIIDC, IMT, Manesar, Gurugram.”

4.2 Apart from that, the landowners have produced the following documents in their documentary evidence:-

<i>Ex.P1</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 ors. Vs. State of Haryana and ors.'</i>
<i>Ex.P2</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 ors. Vs. State of Haryana and ors.'</i>
<i>Ex.P3</i>	<i>Copy of Award dated 27.1.2010 passed by the Court of Shri. Kuldeep Jain, the then learned ADJ, Gurugram in case titled as 'Om Parkash and ors. Vs. State of Haryana and ors.'</i>
<i>Ex.P4</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 28.8.2008 vide which the land measuring 38151.24 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 16,02,35,208/-</i>
<i>Ex.P5</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 20.8.2008 vide which the land measuring 450 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 11,25,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.P6</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 14.8.2009 vide which the land measuring 1800 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 39,60,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.P7</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 13.8.2008 vide which the land measuring 1800 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 39,60,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.P8</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 27.8.2008 vide which the land measuring 450 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 16,65,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.P9</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 4.2.2009 vide which the land measuring 1012.50 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 25,31,250/-</i>
<i>Ex.P10</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 4.2.2009 vide which the land measuring 1012.50 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 25,31,250/-</i>
<i>Ex.P11</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 20.1.2009 vide which the land measuring 450 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 9,90,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.P12</i>	<i>Copy of Conveyance Deed dated 12.1.2009 vide which the land measuring 450 sq.mtr situated in IMT Manesar was sold for ₹ 8,38,260/-</i>
<i>Ex.P13</i>	<i>Copy of Sale Deed dated 27.6.2006 vide which the land measuring 9K-01M situated in Village Bas Haria was sold for ₹ 62,21,875/-</i>
<i>Ex.P14</i>	<i>Copy of Sale Deed dated 27.6.2006 vide which the land measuring 9K-01M situated in Village Bas Haria was sold for ₹ 62,21,875/-</i>

Ex.P15	Copy of Sale Deed dated 28.6.2006 vide which the land measuring 9K-01M situated in Village Bas Haria was sold for ₹ 62,20,000/-
Ex.P16	Copy of Sale Deed dated 28.6.2006 vide which the land measuring 64K-18M situated in Village Bas Haria was sold for ₹ 4,12,50,000/-
Ex.P17	Copy of Sale Deed dated 28.6.2006 vide which the land measuring 48K-19M situated in Village Bas Haria was sold for ₹ 3,08,00,000/-
Ex.P18 Ex.P22	Site Plans/Aksh Sijra
Ex.P23	Copy of Sale Deed dated 14.12.2006 vide which the land measuring 05K-13M situated in Village Naharpur Kasan was sold for ₹ 1,13,00,000/-
Ex.P24	Copy of Sale Deed dated 05.12.2006 vide which the land measuring 03K-14M situated in Village Naharpur Kasan was sold for ₹ 74,00,000/-
Ex.P25	Copy of Sale Deed dated 05.12.2006 vide which the land measuring 05K-13M situated in Village Naharpur Kasan was sold for ₹ 1,13,00,000/-
Ex.P26	Copy of Sale Deed dated 04.12.2006 vide which the land measuring 12K-16.5M situated in Village Naharpur Kasan was sold for ₹ 2,56,50,000/-
Ex.P27	Copy of Sale Deed dated 28.4.2004 vide which the land measuring 96K-13M situated in Village Bas Haria was sold for ₹ 13,62,00,000/-
Ex.P28	Copy of Award dated 27.2.2012 passed by the Court of Shri. Vikram Aggarwal the then learned ADJ, Gurugram in case titled as ‘Hari Mohan and ors. Vs. State of Haryana and ors.’
Ex.P29	Site Plan
Ex.P30	Site Plan
Ex.P31	Copy of Mutation No.542
Ex.P32	Copy of Field Book
Ex.P33	Aksh Shijra
Ex.P34	Copy of Sale Deed dated 18.8.2003 vide which the land measuring 1K-4M situated in Village Bas Kusla was sold for ₹ 7,30,000/-
Ex.P35	Copy of Sale Deed dated 11.4.2005 vide which the land measuring 0K-12M situated in Village Bas Kusla was sold for ₹ 7,25,000/-
Ex.P36	Copy of Sale Deed dated 3.3.2006 vide which the land measuring 1K-9M situated in Village Bas Kusla was sold for ₹ 36,40,588/-
Ex.P37	Copy of Sale Deed dated 3.3.2006 vide which the land measuring 1K-4M situated in Village Bas Kusla was sold for ₹ 30,12,900/-
Ex.P38	Copy of Sale Deed dated 3.3.2006 vide which the land measuring 0K-10M situated in Village Bas Kusla was sold for ₹ 12,55,375/-

<i>Ex.P29</i>	<i>Site Plan</i>
<i>Ex.P39</i>	<i>Aksh Shijra</i>
<i>Ex.P40</i>	<i>Copy of Mutation No.543</i>
<i>Ex.P41</i>	<i>Copy of Field Book</i>
<i>Ex.P42</i>	<i>Aksh Shijra</i>
<i>Ex.P42</i>	<i>Copy of order dated 11.1.2019 passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in SLP No.19284-19290 of 2019 titled as Wazir and Anr. Vs. State of Haryana.</i>
<i>Ex.PW8/A</i>	<i>Detail of expenditure incurred on development of Phase I to IV and Transport Hub at IMT Manesa</i>
<i>Mark PA</i>	<i>Site Plan</i>
<i>Mark PB</i>	<i>Site Plan</i>
<i>Mark PC</i>	<i>Site Plan</i>
<i>Mark PD</i>	<i>Site Plan</i>
<i>Mark PE/1 to PE/12</i>	<i>Photographs</i>
<i>Mark PF/1 to PF/19</i>	<i>Copy of R.C. of Vehicle No.HR26BN0004 & Toll receipts.</i>

4.3 On the other hand, HSIIDC examined RW1 Sh. B.S. Rana, Senior Manager, (IA), KMP Cell, HSIIDC, and produced the following documents in their documentary evidence:-

<i>Ex.R1</i>	<i>Copy of Award no. 20 dt. 10.05.2006</i>
<i>Ex.R2</i>	<i>Aksh Shijra/Site plan</i>
<i>Ex.R3</i>	<i>Copy of Letter Sent by Deputy Commissioner to Sub Divisional Officer (Civil) Gurugram</i>
<i>Ex.R4</i>	<i>Copy of Policy for Rehabilitation and resettlement of landowners</i>
<i>Ex.R5/R12</i>	<i>Copy of Sale Deed dated 25.3.2005 vide which the land measuring 16 kanal 17M situated in Village Dhana was sold for ₹ 15,00,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R6/R10</i>	<i>Copy of Sale Deed dt. 4.10.2004 vide which the land measuring 5 kanal 4 marla situated in Village Dhana was sold for ₹2,90,279/-</i>
<i>Ex.R7/R11</i>	<i>Copy of Sale Deed dated 15.3.2005 vide which the land measuring 16 kanal 8 marla situated in Village Dhana was sold for ₹ 10,00,000/-</i>
<i>Ex.R8</i>	<i>Copy of Award dated 20.11.2010 passed by the Court of Shri. S.K. Kaushik, the then ADJ, Palwal in case titled as ‘Ramji Lal and ors. Vs. State of Haryana and Ors.’</i>
<i>Ex.R9</i>	<i>Copy of Award dated 11.06.2010 passed by the Court of Shri. S.K. Kaushik, the then ADJ, Palwal in case titled as ‘Smt.Rajnia and ors. Vs. State of Haryana and Ors.’</i>
<i>Ex.R13</i>	<i>Copy of Sale Deed dated 4.4.2005 vide which the land measuring 12 kanal-0M situated in Village Dhana was sold for ₹ 7,50,000/-</i>

Ex.R14	Integrated Shijra Plan
--------	------------------------

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

5.1 The learned senior counsel contends that the Reference Court has erred in ignoring the relevant sale deeds Ex.P4 to P12, with respect to:-

A. Industrial Model Township, Manesar, which is adjacent to Village Dhana. He refers to the site plan Ex.PE/1 and Ex.PE/13. He further submits that there is a huge construction by various multinational companies which show the potential market value of the acquired land.

B. He further draws the attention of the Court to a conveyance deed dated 19.08.2008, Ex.P5, with respect to a plot measuring 450 sq. mtrs. which was allotted by HSIIDC vide allotment letter dated 13.12.2004, to stress on the point that the market value determined by the Reference Court is erroneous.

C. Similarly, he draws the attention of the Court to another conveyance deed dated 12.08.2008, with respect to the plot measuring 1800 sq. mtrs. He submits that the aforesaid plot was allotted on 07.08.2002, for Rs.39,60,000/-. He further draws the attention of the Court to Ex.P9 which is a copy of the conveyance deed dated 03.02.2009, with respect to the plot measuring 1012.5 sq. mtrs. and was allotted vide allotment letter dated 13.12.2004, for Rs.25,31,250/-. He further refers to documents Ex.P13 to P17 with respect to the sale of land in Village Bas Hariya, Ex.P23 to Ex.P27 are exemplar deeds with respect to the sale of land in Village Naharpur Kasan and Ex.P35 to P38 are exemplar deeds with respect to the land located in Village Bas Khusla. He contends that these sale deeds have been

wrongly ignored by the Reference Court. He further refers to Ex.P44, a copy of the conveyance deed dated 19.05.2005, with respect to the land measuring 457 sq. yards which was sold for Rs.9,88,000/-. The learned counsel further draws the attention of the Court to Ex.P2, a copy of the award with respect to acquisition of land in Village Dhana, decided by the Reference Court vide judgment dated 18.12.2010. In this case, the acquisition of land was initiated vide notification dated 27.09.2005, under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The learned counsel contends that the Reference Court has assessed the market value of the land at Rs.46,07,890/- per acre.

D. The learned counsel further contends that the Reference Court should have relied upon the assessment of market value of a different parcel of land made under award Ex.P2. Subsequently, in *M/s Acquainted Realtors LLP Etc. Etc. Vs. State of Haryana and others AIR 2021 (SC) 1969*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has, with respect to the acquisition of different parcel of land in Village Dhana, assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.47,10,000/- per acre.

E. He further prays for grant of damages on account of bisection of the unacquired land into different parcels. He submits that the landowners are entitled to 50% severance charges for the unacquired land.

5.2 On the other hand, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC while referring to Section 25 of the 1894 Act has contended that the Reference Court has erred in overlooking the sale exemplars produced by the Corporation. He submits that the Reference Court has wrongly interpreted Section 25 of the 1894 Act, while ignoring the sale exemplars produced by the Corporation, on the ground that these sale exemplars reflect

a price lesser than what has been awarded by the Land Acquisition Collector. He further submits that the landowners have failed to produce any comparable sale exemplar of the contemporaneous period with respect to the land located in Village Dhana. He further submits that the Reference Court has also erred in relying upon the market value of acquired land assessed under a different notification with respect to a separate parcel of acquired land made by the Supreme Court in Wazir and another Vs. State of Haryana and other connected cases, 2019(13) SCC 101, particularly when the various relevant sale exemplars were produced by the Corporation.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 It is evident that the Reference Court has erred in ignoring the sale exemplars produced by the HSIIDC. Section 25 of the 1894 Act does not prohibit the Reference Court from taking 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. Reliance 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. In this judgment, while referring to the size of an agricultural land, various phrases/words have been used. Hence, it is considered necessary to note their respective meaning.

1 Rectangle	=	5 X 5 = 25 Acre
1 Acre	=	160 Marlas
8 Kanal	=	1 Acre
1 Kanal	=	20 Marlas
1 Acre	=	4840 Sq. Yards

1 Marla	=	272.251=30.25 Sq. Yards
1 Inch	=	2.54 cm
1 Foot	=	12 Inch
1 Sq. Feet	=	12 X 12 = 144 Inch
1 Yard	=	3 Feet
1 Sq. Yard	=	9 Sq. Feet
100 Sq. Yards	=	900 Sq. Feet
1 Kanal	=	0.125 Acre
1 Marla	=	0.00625001 Acre

7. ISSUE NO.2

7.1 The issue No.2 is being dealt with, foremost. The stage is set for analysing the arguments of the learned counsel representing the landowners. The first argument is with reference to conveyance deeds (Ex.P4 to Ex.P12). It may be noted here that Ex.P4 to Ex.P12 are conveyance deeds executed by HSIIDC in favour of the allottee of a developed industrial plot in Industrial Model Township, Manesar. Similar is the position with regard to Ex.P5, P6, PW6/1. These conveyance deeds are with respect to the plots located in a developed Industrial Model Township and therefore, is not appropriate to rely upon the same particularly when sufficient sale deeds of the acquired land itself are available. The second argument of the learned counsel representing the appellant is also answered in the same terms. The next argument of the learned counsel representing the appellants is again with reference to conveyance deed Ex.P7/P17 and has been aptly answered in the first argument. Further, same is the position with regard to Ex.P9.

7.2 The next argument of the learned counsel representing the appellant is with reference to sale deeds Ex.P12 to Ex.P17, which are the sale deeds of various parcels of the land located in Village Bas Hariya. The

vendees in all these sale deeds are corporate entities. In the absence of any evidence to the effect that the aforesaid parcels of land are comparable with the acquired land, the Reference Court has, correctly, held that these sale exemplars cannot be relied upon. Similarly, Ex.P23 to Ex.P27 are the sale exemplars of sale of different parcels of land located in Village Naharpur Kasan. Similarly, Ex.P35 to Ex.P38 are with respect to the parcels of land located in Village Bas Khusla. In the absence of any evidence to show how these parcels of land, sold through the various sale deeds, located in different villages are comparable with the acquired land, it is not appropriate to rely upon the same. The Reference Court has also refused to rely upon these sale deeds for the same reasons. The next argument of the learned counsel representing the landowners is with reference to sale deed Ex.P44. This sale deed is of a developed plot, in Village Dhana, located near the developed area comprised in Rectangle No.29, which is part of the *abadi* (residential area) of the village. From a careful perusal of the layout plan Ex.R14, it is apparent that the residential area of the village is comprised in the same part of the land which is comprised in Rectangle No.29. The aforesaid sale deed is with respect to a very small piece of land measuring 657 sq. yards (a little more than 1 kanal) comprised in Rectangle No.29, Khasra No.14 which abuts the residential area of the village. Therefore, is not appropriate to rely upon the aforesaid sale deed, particularly when the various other relevant sale exemplars of the agricultural land, of the acquired area or the nearby area, are available.

7.3 The next argument of the learned counsel representing the petitioner is with reference to Ex.P2, a copy of judgment passed by the

Reference Court on 18.12.2010. The Court was assessing the market value of 1,471 kanals of land in Village Dhana. In this case, the acquisition proceedings were initiated vide notification dated 27.09.2005, whereas, in the present case, the notification was issued on 11.01.2005. In the aforesaid case, the acquisition was for setting up of Chaudhary Devi Lal Industrial Model Township, Manesar. The Court assessed the market value of a different parcel of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.46,07,890/- per acre. Once the various sale exemplars of the acquired land or the adjacent land are available, it is not safe to rely upon the assessment by the Court while determining the market value of different parcels of land located at a distance. It is noted here that the judgment passed by the Reference Court on 18.12.2010, Ex.P2 is stated to have been ultimately decided by the Supreme Court in *M/s Acquainted Realtors LLP Etc. Etc.(supra)*, while assessing the market value of the acquired land under the aforesaid notification at the rate of Rs.47,10,500/- per acre. This matter has been examined while discussing issue No.1.

7.4 Now, let us examine the layout plan produced by the HSIIDC which has been exhibited as Ex.R14 (page 1149 of the trial Court record). The land measuring 5 kanals and 4 marlas was sold at the rate of Rs.1,88,681/- per acre through sale exemplar Ex.R6, dated 04.10.2004. In this sale deed, the undivided portion of joint land, to the extent of 5 kanals and 4 marlas, has been purchased. The sale is of a part of land comprised in Rectangle No.9, Khasra No.7/2, 8, 9, Rectangle No.32, Khasra No.11/1 and 12/1. Sh. Bodan, son of Sh. Har Narain has purchased the undivided share.

From a careful perusal of Ex.R14, the layout plan, it is evident that some

part of the land purchased, in the aforesaid sale deed Ex.R-6, has been acquired. On a careful reading of the statement of Sh. Ram Pal, son of Sh. Bodan, son of Sh. Har Narain, it is evident that 2 kanals and 10 marlas land out of the land comprised in Rectangle No.9, Khasra No.9, has been acquired. Although, no doubt, through sale exemplar Ex.R6, dated 04.10.2004, the land from Rectangle No.9 and 32, has been purchased, however, it is evident from the statement of Sh. Ram Pal that they purchased the land from Rectangle No.9, because they previously also owned some land in Rectangle No.9. Furthermore, Sh. Bodan could not have purchased 5 kanals and 4 marlas of land from the land comprised in Rectangle No.32 which is located at a little distance because the same vendor was not the owner of the land, measuring 5 kanals and 4 marlas, in the aforesaid Rectangle. Thus, the aforesaid sale deeds should be preferred particularly when some part of the land has been acquired. The opinion of the Court further gets affirmed by examining sale deed Ex.R13, dated 04.04.2005. Through this sale instance, 12 kanals of land was sold. This parcel of land is at a distance of 7 acres from the acquired land. The land was sold at the rate of Rs.5,00,000/- per acre. Similarly, there is another sale exemplar Ex.R5/R12, dated 25.03.2005, with respect to land measuring 16 kanals and 17 marlas. Through this sale deed, the land has been sold at the rate of Rs.7,12,166/- per acre. This parcel of land is located around 12 acres away from the acquired land. The Corporation has also produced sale exemplars Ex.R7/R11 dated 15.03.2005, with respect to sale of land measuring 16 kanals and 8 marlas at the rate of Rs.4,87,805/- per acre. This parcel of land, which is located at a distance of 6 acres from the acquired land, has been

purchased by a corporate entity.

8. ISSUE NO.1

8.1 As already noticed, this Bench has decided a large number of appeals arising from same acquisition although located in different parcels of land. After discussing the case law on the subject, while deciding **RFA-684-2021**, titled as **“HSI IDC Vs. Mahender Singh and others”**, decided on 14.10.2021, it has been observed that it is not safe to rely upon the assessment of the market value of a different parcel of the acquired land even in the same village unless the Court comes to the conclusion that the sale exemplars of acquired land or nearby land are not available. Hence, it is imperative to extract the relevant discussion from the aforesaid judgment, for the sake of convenience, clarity and judicious use of time. The same is 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.”

8.2 In the Court's humble opinion, it is not appropriate to outrightly rely upon the assessment made by the Supreme Court, in **M/s Acquainted Realtors LLP Etc. Etc.(supra)**, particularly when the sale exemplars of the acquired land, itself, have been produced and proved before the Court.

9. ISSUE NO.3

9.1 The issue No.3 has, also, been elaborately examined by the Court in **RFA-813-2021**, titled as **Baljeet Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and others**, decided on 17.11.2021, while deciding various appeals arising from the same notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act with respect to the land located in Village Patli Hazipur. The aforesaid relevant discussion is extracted 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."*

9.2 Accordingly, the issue No.3 has been, meticulously, answered in the aforesaid reproduction.

10. ISSUE NO.4

10.1 The issue No.4 has also been examined in-depth by the Court in **RFA-421-2021**, titled as **HSI IDC Vs. Om Dutt and others**, decided on 07.10.2021, while examining various appeals arising from the same notification with respect to the land located in Village Sultanpur. The aforesaid 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.”

11. Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the appeals filed by the HSIIDC are allowed, whereas, that of the landowners are dismissed. The market value of the acquired land is decreased to Rs.14,52,010/- per acre. In other words, the market value is reduced by Rs.22,52,567/- per acre. 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 landowner 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.

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

29th November, 2021

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Ay

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

1.	RFA-641-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S SURESH AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-654-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S HARISH KUMAR AND ORS
3.	RFA-655-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S MANGE RAM AND ORS
4.	RFA-656-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S PRITHVI AND ORS

5.	RFA-657-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S M/S JANUS INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS PVT LTD AND ORS
6.	RFA-658-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S SPIRITUAL DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD.
7.	RFA-659-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S DHARAM SINGH AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-660-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S RANBIR SINGH AND ORS
9.	RFA-661-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S UDAI SINGH AND ORS
10.	RFA-662-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S MAHABIR SINGH AND ORS
11.	RFA-663-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S BHAGWAN SINGH AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-664-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S ASHOK KUMAR AND OTHERS
13.	RFA-665-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S BODAN DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
14.	RFA-666-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S ACQUAINTED REALTORS AND OTHERS
15.	RFA-667-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S HARI PAL RANA AND ORS

16.	RFA-668-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S PURAN SINGH AND OTHERS
17.	RFA-669-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S DHARAMBIR AND ORS
18.	RFA-670-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S RAM KALA AND ANR
19.	RFA-671-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S OM PARKASH AND ORS
20.	RFA-706-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED V/S BALRAJ SINGH AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-807-2021	RAM KALA (DEAD) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
22.	RFA-808-2021	ASHOK KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-809-2021	DHARAM SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
24.	RFA-812-2021	OM PARKASH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
25.	RFA-814-2021	SURESH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-815-2021	MANGE RAM AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-816-2021	PURAN SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-817-2021	HARISH KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
29.	RFA-818-2021	PIRTHVI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
30.	RFA-2062-2021	BODAN, DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS V/S LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR CUM SDO(C) GURUGAON
31.	RFA-2063-2021	DHARAMBIR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

32.	RFA-911-2021	BHAGWAN SINGH V/S HARYANA STATE AND OTHERS
33.	RFA-805-2021	HARI PAL RANA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**