

**RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases**

1

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

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.11.2021

Nafe Singh (deceased) through his L.RS and others

....Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Present: Mr. S.P. Chahar, Advocate
Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate
Mr. B.S. Saroha, Advocate
for the landowners.

Mr. Narender Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA Nos.1788 to 1790, 2375 of 2019
and RFA Nos.1268 to 1272 of 2019.

Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate
for the applicants-appellants in RFA-2579-2016.

Mr. Sarvesh Malik, Advocate
for the respondent No.1 in CWP-10225, 10222, 13170,
12461 of 2021, 1 to 7 in CWP-10207, 12403 of 2021, 1 and
2 in CWP-12503, 12404, 12412 of 2021, 7, 11 to 15 and 17
in CWP-10214 of 2021, 1 to 6 in CWP-12508 of 2021, 1 to
4 in CWP-12472, 12465 of 2021, 11 to 15 and 17 in CWP-
10210-2021, 1 to 14 in CWP-10534-2021, 1 to 3 in CWP-
12455, 10110, 10198, 10208, 12500 of 2021, 4 in CWP-
10196-2021 and for the private respondents in CWP-12483,
12370 of 2021.

Mr. Ashwani Kumar Chopra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Vidul Kapoor, Advocate, for the HSIIDC in Regular
First Appeals,
Mr. B.R. Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for the HSIIDC in Civil Writ Petitions.

Mr. Deepak Manchanda, Advocate
for the HSIIDC in RFA No.4179 of 2018.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. This judgment shall dispose of a batch of Regular First Appeals as well as the connected writ petitions, details whereof have been given in the foot of the judgment. The writ petitions have been filed by the Haryana State Industrial Infrastructure Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as 'HSIIDC') assailing the correctness of the various identical orders passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as LAC) u/s 28-A of The Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act'). In these writ petitions the stand taken is that the LAC should have waited for final determination by the court before deciding the various applications filed u/s 28-A of 'the 1894 Act'. Learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that these appeals as well as the writ petitions can be disposed of by a common judgment.

2. These appeals have been filed under Section 54 of 'the 1894 Act') assailing the correctness of the award passed by the Reference Court on 21.11.2015 while deciding the various references filed U/s 18 of the 1894 Act. It may be noted here that another batch of five applications under Section 18 of the 1894 Act was decided by the Reference Court by a separate judgment dated 22.03.2018, assessing the identical market value similar to the assessment made by the Reference Court vide a judgment dated 21.11.2015. However, out of those five reference applications, 4 petitions u/s 18 of the 1894 Act were dismissed

as being time barred, whereas one such application filed by Dharamvir and others was allowed.

3. At the outset, it is important to note that with respect to the land located in village Kheri Sadh (the village in question in the present case), this Court has already decided a batch of appeals on 21.09.2021 with the main judgment in **Managing Director, HSIIDC and another vs. Splendour Land Base Limited and another** (RFA-926-2017). In the aforesaid batch of appeals, the process of acquisition of the land was initiated on 09.06.2006 by issuing a notification u/s 4 of the 1894 Act. This Court assessed the market value of the acquired land abutting the National Highway-10 upto the depth of 1 acre at the rate of Rs.28,70,000/- per acre whereas the remaining land in the interior has been assessed at Rs.19,77,000/- per acre.

4. Thereafter, once again the State of Haryana, in order to utilize the land for developing an industrial modern township, issued a new notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 13.02.2008 expressing its intention to acquire a very large tract of the land. The LAC vide an award no. 13 dated 30.11.2009 assessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.16,00,000/- per acres. On the request of the landowners, the various applications were referred to the Reference Court under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. The learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak (Reference Court) vide a judgment dated 11.08.2011 has assessed the market value of the acquired land abutting the National Highway no.10 Rohtak Delhi Road upto the depth

of 1 acre at rate of Rs.28,50,000/- per acre whereas the market value for the remaining land in the interior/away from the National Highway has been assessed at the rate of Rs.21,37,000/-.

5. The landowners have claimed that the acquired land has a great potential as it is located on National Highway no.10 and the presence of various hotels and banquet halls increases its potential value. Dilyar Lake is adjacent to the acquired land. It has further been pointed out that various educational institutions like Shri Baba Mast Nath College of Engineering, an Eye Hospital, an Ayurvedic College, a College of Pharmacy, a College of Physiotherapy, Shree Baba Mast Nath Residential School, Indus Public School, DGV Public School and DGV Centenary Public School, Rohtak and other educational institutions are situated near the aforementioned acquired land. The residential colonies namely the Government Employees Cooperative Housing Society Limited, Suncity project and Omex Project and Sector 27 are also located nearby the land of acquisition. It has further been alleged that Maharishi Dayanand University and Pandit B.D.Sharma PGIMS Rohtak are situated at a walking distance from the said land. Haryana Urban Development Authority has also acquired the land located in the village Kheri Sadh wherein the LAC has offered to acquire the land at the rate of Rs.33.11 lakh per acre. Similarly, the acquired land for industrial model township located in villages Bohar and Gadhi Bohar has been offered an amount of Rs.29.70 lakh acre by the LAC. The landowners claim that the market value of the acquired land is more than Rs.5 crores per acre.

On the other hand, respondents have countered the petition by filing a detailed written statement. It has been submitted that the LAC has assessed the market value on the basis of the sale deeds and therefore, the reference applications should be dismissed.

On appreciation of the pleadings, the Reference Court framed the following issues:-

“(1) What was the market value of the acquired land at the time of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894?

(2) Whether the petitioners are entitled to any amount as enhanced compensation as alleged, if so to what extent?OPP.

(3) Whether the petitions are not maintainable? OPR

(4) Whether the petitioners have got no locus standi to file the present petitions?OPR

(5) Relief.”

The landowners in order to prove their case examined Surinder Singh as PW1, Ishwar Singh as PW2, Preet Singh as PW3, Satyawar as PW4. The aforesaid persons are the landowners who stand deprived of their land. The landowners have also examined Vijay Kumar (Kanungo) as PW5 and Harinder Kumar, (Accountant in the office of Tehsildar, Rohtak) as PW6. In the reference applications separately decided vide a judgment dated 22.03.2008 the landowners have examined Sanjay Malhotra as PW1, Smt. Ompati as PW2, Suresh Bhatia as PW3 and Sh. P.S.Dahiya, as PW4. On the other hand, HSIIDC

has examined Vishnu Kumar (Patwari) as RW1 in the first batch of the reference petitions whereas in the second batch of reference petitions, Vishnu Kumar (Patwari) has been re-examined apart from examining Anil Kumar (Patwari) as RW2.

Apart from the aforesaid oral evidence, the landowners have produced the following documentary evidence, which is extracted as under:-

“Ex.P1	Sale Deed No. 238 dated 12.5.2006
Ex.P2	Sale Deed No. 675 dated 15.6.2007
Ex.P3	Sale Deed No. 682 dated 26.6.2006
Ex.P4	Sale Deed No. 1870 dated 10.4.2006
Ex.P5	Sale Deed No. 2689 dated 19.2.2007
Ex.P6	Sale Deed No. 2223 dated 20.10.2009
Ex.P7	Sale Deed No. 120 dated 16.4.2007
Ex.P8	Sale Deed No. 441 dated 25.5.2007
Ex.P9	Sale Deed No. 682 dated 26.6.2006
Ex.P10	Copy of Award No.4 of 13.7.2009
Ex.P11	Copy of Award No.13 of 30.11.2009
Ex.P12	Copy of Award No.18 of 3.1.2013
Ex.P13	Aks Sizra
Ex.P14	Sale Deed No.2870 dated 28.2.2014
Ex.P15	Sale Deed No.2856 dated 26.2.2014
Ex.P16	Haryana Govt. Notification No.18/37/11-3CI dated 27.4.2012
Ex.P17	Aks Sizra

In the second batch of reference petitions, the landowners have produced the following documents:-

Ex.P1	Special Power of Attorney
Ex.P2	Sale Deed No.1757 dated 02.11.2012
Ex.P3	Certified copy of judgment dated 21.11.2015

	passed in case “Smt. Jagwanti and others vs. State of Haryana and others”
Ex.P4	Sale Deed No. 682 dated 26.06.2006
Ex.P5	Sale Deed No. 1739 dated 30.10.2012
Ex.P6 & P7	Electricity Bills
Ex.P8	Mutation No.2959
Ex.P9	Mutation No.2960
Ex.P10	Mutation No.2961
Ex.P11	Mutation No.2950
Ex.P12	Mutation No.2949
Ex.P13	Jamabandi for the year 2010-2011
Ex.P14	Jamabandi for the year 2010-2011
Ex.P15 & P16	Aks Shizra
Ex.P17 to P19	Photographs
Ex.P20	Valuation Report of Banquet Hall
Ex.P21	Valuation Report of Resort/Hotel
Ex.P22	Sale Deed No. 1757 dated 02.11.2012
Ex.P23	Sale Deed No. 1280 dated 14.11.2008

On the other hand, in the first batch of reference petitions,
the HSIIDC has produced the following documents

Ex.R1	Authority Letter
Ex.R2	Sale Deed No. 2746 dated 26.2.2007
Ex.R3	Sale Deed No. 1640 dated 27.10.2007
Ex.R4	Sale Deed No. 1735 dated 12.8.2009
Ex.R5	Supplementary Award No.11 dated 4.2.2011
Ex.R6	Supplementary Award No.11A dated 11.4.2011
Ex.R7	Haryana Govt. Notification No.5451-R-V-2007 /13258 dated 7.12.2007
Ex.R9	Statement No.19
Ex.R10	Copy of Award No. 13 dated 30.11.2009
Ex.R11	Agenda of meeting of HSIIDC
Ex.R12	Award No.5 dated 30.4.2007

Whereas in the second batch of reference applications, the

following documents were produced:-

Ex.R1	Authority Letter
Ex.R2	Sale Deed No. 225 dated 12.05.2006
Ex.R3	Sale Deed No. 2746 dated 26.02.2007
Ex.R5	Sale Deed No. 2742 dated 26.02.2007
Ex.R6	Supplementary Award No.11 of 04.02.2011
Ex.R7	Supplementary Award No.11A dated 11.4.2012
Ex.R8	Supplementary Award No.5 of 2013
Ex.R10	Village & Skill Development Scheme
Ex.R11	Preliminary Survey of structure at IMT (wrongly again mentioned as Ex.R8)
Ex.R12	Detail of supplementary award of village Kheri Sadh (wrongly again mentioned as Ex.R9)

Heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused both the judgments passed by the Reference Court as well as the separate record of the Reference Court with respect to both the batches of the reference petitions which had been requisitioned.

The learned counsel representing the appellants has contended that the Reference Court has erred in refusing to rely upon the sale exemplar (Ex.P5) dated 19.02.2007. He contends that while assessing the market value the landowners are entitled to rely upon the sale exemplar with the highest price. He further contends that learned court has erred in increasing the price merely at the rate of 9% per annum whereas the Reference Court should have hiked the price while giving increase @ 12% per annum. It is contended that the sale exemplar Ex.P5 is with respect to a large chunk land measuring 7 acre 1

kanal and 15 marlas and therefore, the court has erred in assessing the market value by applying deduction of 25%. Sh. Narwal, learned counsel appearing for some of the landowners while drawing the attention of the Court to the award passed by the LAC (Ex.P12), with respect to acquisition of land initiated on 11.01.2010 vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, assessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.33 lakhs per acre. He contends that the aforesaid parcel of land is also located in village Kheri Sadh, therefore, the owners are entitled to the same amount.

Per contra, learned counsel representing the HSIIDC has contended that the Reference Court has erred in ignoring the sale exemplars produced by them. He contends that the Reference Court has erred in refusing to consider the aforesaid sale exemplar on the ground that the aforesaid sale instances depict market value lower than what was assessed by the LAC.

At this stage, it may be important to notice the sale exemplar produced by both the parties. The sale exemplars produced by the landowners have been compiled in tables 1 & 2 whereas the sale exemplars produced by the State have been compiled in tables 3 &4.

Table I
(The sale deeds produced by the landowners in Ist batch of reference petitions)

Sr No	Exhibit	Vasika No.	Date	Land Area	Total sale consideration	Rate per acre in Rs.	Revenue Estate
1.	P1	238	12.5.2006	14 marla	4,06,500/-	46,45,714/-	Village Kheri Sadh
2.	P2	675	15.6.2007	10 marla	5,21,000/-	83,36,000/-	-do-

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

10

3.	P3	682	26.6.2006	2 Acre	50,00,000/-	25,00,000/-	-do-
4.	P4	1870	10.11.2006	6 kanal 2 marla	19,06,250/-	25,00,000/-	-do-
5.	P5	2689	19.2.2007	57 kanal 15 marla	1,81,00,000/-	25,07,359/-	-do-
6.	P6	2223	20.10.2009	7 kanal 15 marla	63,00,000/-	65,03,225/-	Village Kharawar
7.	P7	441	25.5.2007	32 kanal 5 marla	1,93,49,760/-	47,99,940/-	Village Kharawar
8.	P8	120	16.4.2007	1kanal 7 marla	8,06,400/-	47,78,667/-	Village Kharawar
9.	P9	682	26.6.2006	16 kanal	50,00,000/-	25,00,000/-	Village Kheri Sadh
10.	P14	2870	28.2.2014	1 Acre 1 Kanal	1,82,52,594/-	1,62,24,528/-	Village Kheri Sadh
11.	P15	2856	26.2.2014	1 Acre 1 kanal	1,82,52,594/-	1,62,24,528/-	Village Kheri Sadh

Table 2

(The sale deeds produced in 2nd batch of reference petitions decided by the Reference Court on 22.03.2008)

Sr. No	Exhibit	Vasika No.	Date	Land Area	Total Sale consideration	Revenue Estate
1.	P2	1757	02.11.2012	1 Acre 3 kanal 7 marla	2,38,77,562.00	Kheri Sadh
2.	P4	682	26.06.2006	2 Acre	50,00,000/-	Kheri Sadh
3.	P5	1739	30.10.2012	1 Acre	1,68,30,000/-	Kheri Sadh
4.	P22	1757	02.11.2012	1 Acre 3 Kanal 7 Marla	2,38,77,562.00	Kheri Sadh
5.	P23	1280	14.11.2008	2 kanal 4 marla	9,31,000/-	Kheri Sadh

Table 3

(Details of the sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC in Ist batch of reference petitions)

Sr. No.	Ex.No.	Dated	Transaction Value	Area	Rate per acre (in Rs.)	Village
1.	R/2	26.02.2007	64,95,707/-	49 Kanal 15 Marla	10,44,535/-	Kheri Sadh
2.	R/3	22.10.2007	15,14,928/-	11 Kanal	11,01,765/-	Kheri Sadh
3.	R/4	12.08.2009	27,40,000/-	1 Acre 5 Kanal 14 Marla	16,00,000/-	Kheri Sadh

Table 4

(Details of the sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC in 2nd batch of reference petitions)

Sr. No.	Exhibit	Dated	Transaction value	Area	Rate per acre (in Rs.)	Village
1.	R/2	12.05.2006	7,82,000/-	12 Kanal 10 Marla	5,00,480/-	Kheri Sadh
2.	R/3	26.02.2007	64,95,707/-	49 Kanal 15 marla	10,44,535/-	Kheri Sadh
3.	R/4	05.03.2007	48,00,000/-	68 kanal 6 marla	5,62,226/-	Kheri Sadh
4.	R/5	26.02.2007	65,83,927/-	30 kanal 12 marla	10,40,937/-	Kheri Sadh

4. Statutory Provisions:-

4.1 Before this Bench proceeds to examine the respective contentions of the learned counsel representing the parties, it would be appropriate to notice the relevant provisions of the 1894 Act. It is provided in Section 15 of the 1894 Act, that while determining the amount of compensation, the Collector shall be guided by the provisions contained in Section 23 and 24 of the 1894 Act. Hence, Section 23 to 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 law 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.”

5. Discussion by the Court:-

5.1 It is evident from the reading of the first part of Section 23 of the 1894 Act that the market value of the land is to be determined according to the market value prevailing at the date of publication of notification under Section 4 (1) of 1894 Act. No further guidelines for the assessment of the amount for a fair market value have been provided in the 1894 Act. Sub-section (1-A) of section 23 of the 1894 Act provides that while determining the amount of compensation to be awarded for the land acquired, the court, apart from the market value of the land, is required to award an amount calculated at the rate of 12% per

annum at such market value for the period commencing on and from the date of publication of notification under Section 4 (1) of the 1894 Act, till the date of award passed by the Collector or till the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier. Under sub-section 2 of section 23 of the 1894 Act, the court, in addition to the market value of the land, is required to award a sum of 30% on such market value towards the compulsory nature of the acquisition. Section 24 of the 1894 Act enlists the various factors which are required to be neglected while determining the fair market value. Section 25 of the 1894 Act provides that the court shall not award the amount of compensation which is lower than the amount awarded by the LAC.

5.2 It is crystal clear from the careful reading of the aforesaid statutory provisions that while determining the market value of the acquired land, the court is required to examine the existing geographical location of the acquired land apart from its present and potential use. The Court is also required to examine as to whether the acquired land has nearness to any National Highway, State Highway or any developed area. The market value of the other land situated in the same locality/area or adjacent to or very near to the acquired land can also be taken into consideration by the court. While assessing the market value the Court is required to see as to what would be the price on which a willing seller would sell the land to a willing purchaser. The standard method of determination of the market value of any acquired land, is to ascertain the market value of the acquired land with reference to the open market sale of a comparable land in the neighbourhood, by a

willing seller to a willing buyer, on or before the date of the preliminary notification, as that would give a fair indication of the market value.

5.3 While adjudicating the market value of the acquired land, the Courts are expected to award “just” “fair” and “appropriate” amount on the basis of the material available on the record. The Court is not expected to distribute the public money with largesse. It is the duty of the Court to maintain a proper equilibrium between the parties. If the Courts lean in favour of the landowners, the government or the allottees are likely to be unnecessarily over-burdened and it will result in the distribution of the public money. Whereas if the courts are inclined towards the government, it can result in undermining of the just claims of the landowners with regard to compulsory acquisitions. Therefore, a proper balance has to be drawn, guided by the facts of case and to preserve the public interest and the public resources, as a whole.

Unequivocally, it has been held in **Mehrawal Khewaji Trust vs. State of Punjab (2012) 5 SCC 432 and Lal Chand vs. Union of India (2009) 15 SCC 769** case that the landowners who stand deprived of the land are required to be paid the market value on the basis of the genuine sale exemplar depicting the highest price. In the present case, the crucial date for determination of the market value of the land is 13.02.2008. The Reference Court has correctly refused to rely upon sale exemplars Ex.P1 and P2 (in table 1) being of very small size as compared to a large tract of acquired land. The sale exemplar Ex.P4 (in table 1) is also of a relatively small size. The sale exemplars Ex.P6 and

Ex.P8 (in table 1) pertain to the parcel of the land located in a different village. The sale exemplars Ex.P14 and P15 in table 1 are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, therefore, should not be relied upon. Moreover, in table 2, the sale exemplars Ex.P2, P5, P22 and P23 are related to the period, post the date of notification, therefore, these should not be relied upon. In table 2 Ex.P4 is the same sale deed as has been noticed as Ex.P3 in table 1.

The sale deed exemplars Ex.P3 and P5 (in table 1) are of the contemporaneous period when compared with the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Through sale exemplar Ex.P5, 7 acre 1 kanal 15 marlas (57 kanals 15 marlas) land has been sold at the rate of Rs.25,07,359/- per acre in favour of M/s Splendour Landbase Pvt. Ltd. Through sale exemplar Ex.P3 in table 1, the land measuring 2 Acres (16 kanal) has been sold. The average per acre sale price of sale exemplar Ex.P3 (in table 1) also comes to Rs.25,00,000/- per acre. Furthermore, on a careful perusal of sale exemplar Ex.P3 (in table 1), it is evident that land comprised in Rect No.17, Killa no.4 and 7 has been sold. Whereas through sale exemplar Ex.P5 (in table 1) the land comprised in Rectangle No.10 has been sold. The rectangle is a unit of measurement of agriculture land in the northern India. It denotes a rectangular plot consisting of 25 acres of the land (5X5 acres.). In each village the land is identified by Rectangle, Killa/Khasra/Acre numbers. Normally, each acre consists of 4840 Sq. Yards of land. Whereas each kanal of land has 605 Sq. Yards of Land. Each Marla has little bit over 30 Sq. Yards of land. A perusal of the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector

on 30.11.2009 with regard to the present acquisition, it is clear that the State acquired the land from Rectangle No.4, 6, 20, 21, 22 etc. etc. Thus, the sale exemplars Ex.P3 and P5 relate to parcels of the land located nearby the acquired land. Undoubtedly, both the parties have failed to produce a proper layout plan while specifying the location of the parcels of the land sold through various sale exemplars. However, the court is required to decide the case on the basis of the material produced by the parties.

Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the sale exemplar produced by the HSIIDC cannot be relied upon, particularly, when the LAC itself has not relied upon the aforesaid sale exemplar. Now the focus shifts to sale exemplar Ex.P5. Through the aforesaid sale deed a substantial big chunk of land measuring 7 acres 1 kanal and 15 marlas (57 kanal 15 marlas) has been sold at the rate of Rs.25,07,359/- per acre. As already noticed, the State of Haryana has already acquired land in the village for developing an industrial model township vide a notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 09.06.2006. It has also come in evidence that the acquired land is not only located near the various educational institutions but is also not far away from the city. Moreover, if one carefully examines the information compiled in table 1, it is evident that the prices of the land increased significantly after the acquisition of the land by the first notification. There is a difference of one year between the sale exemplar Ex.P5 dated 19.02.2007 and notification dated 13.02.2008 under Section 4 of the 1894 Act in the present case. As industrialization has started taking place in the

aforesaid area, therefore, it would be appropriate to increase the price by 12% per annum. The view of this Court get reinforced from Ex.P14 and P15 from table 1. Thus, the Court arrives at a figure of Rs.28,08,242/- per acre.

There is yet another equally important aspect of the matter which needs adjudication. The Reference Court has applied a cut/deduction of 20% on the amount of Rs. 28,50,000/-to arrive at a figure of Rs.21,37,000/- per acre. The question is whether in accordance with the facts and circumstances of the case, was it appropriate for the Reference Court to apply the cut/deduction at all. If the answer is yes, then the question regarding the appropriate percentage arises.

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, have been held entitled to a sum of 30% on such market value in lieu of the compulsory nature of acquisition. In a common legal parlance, this amount is called solatium. This part of the amount is in the nature of compensation to the owner for taking away his property without his consent. In the 1894 Act, it has mandated that the landowner should be paid apart from the market value of the land, 30% compulsory acquisition charges known as solatium to adequately compensate him for the land so acquired.

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's case (supra)*, the Court noticed 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 works. In other words, whenever the acquisition is for carrying out a developmental work like setting up a residential/commercial or industrial township or 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 such deduction is with regard to cost of development works to be carried out by the acquiring agency. 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 extent of agriculture 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 development cost to arrive at an appropriate value for the 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. There are large number of judgments on the issue however, it would not be appropriate to notice all of them. However, certain precedents are needed to be noticed.

In *Anjani Molu Dessai vs State Of Goa & Anr (2010) 13 SCC 710*, the Court held that ordinarily calculating/creating an average of the various sale exemplars is not permissible. The sale exemplar of highest market value should be preferred in absence of the evidence to the contrary. It was further held that in case of a several sale exemplars

of comparable pieces of land, the prices of the exemplars ranging in a narrow bandwidth, the average thereof can be taken. In this case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was into assessing the market value of 3,65,375 square meter of land in village Balli, Goa. The LAC had deducted 45% from the market value depicted in the sale exemplar. In para 16, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that no deduction is permissible in case sale is of a comparable land of reasonable size, which is extracted as under:

“16. The Land Acquisition Collector however committed a serious error in deducting 45% from the sale price disclosed by the sale deed dated 30-8-1989 towards the cost of development. It is well settled that deduction for development cost has to be made only where the value of a small residential/commercial/industrial plot of land in a developed layout is made the basis for arriving at the market value of a nearly large tract of undeveloped agricultural land. Where the land sold under the relied upon sale deed and the acquired lands are both of similar nature (as in this case where both are bharad lands) the question of making any deduction towards development cost to arrive at the cost of “undeveloped land” would not arise. Such a deduction would have been necessary if the sale deed relied upon related to a developed residential or commercial plot. Therefore, we are of the view that the Land Acquisition Collector was not justified in making 45% deduction from the price disclosed by the sale deed dated 30-8-1989.”

In *Atma Singh vs. State of Haryana (2008) 2 SCC 568*, the Supreme Court was into assessing the market value of the land acquired for the Sugar factory. It was found out that the sale exemplars of small

parcels of land have been produced to assess the market value of large tract of acquired land. In those circumstances, the court permitted 10% deduction towards the development of the common facilities.

In **Chakas vs. State of Punjab, (2011) 12 SCC 128**, the Supreme Court allowed 10% cut to be applied for common facilities as a considerably big chunk of undeveloped parcel of the acquired land was allotted to the industrial conglomerate. Thus, the court applied cut of 10% for the development.

In **General Manager, Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. vs. Rameshbhai Jivanbhai Patel and another, (2008) 14 SCC 745**, the Court deliberated on the percentage of increase which should be presumed by the court in absence of any other material. This judgment lays down the general guidelines in absence of any material available for determination of the increase to be awarded.

In **Chandrashekhar(D) by LRs and others vs. Land Acquisition Officer and another, (2012) 1 SCC 390**, the court found out that the sale deed exemplar is with respect to a small piece of land of a developed site and that too with respect to the period post the date of notification under Section 4. The court declared that in the facts and circumstances of a particular case, deduction upto 75% is permissible.

In **A.P. Housing Board vs K. Manohar Reddy & Ors. (2010) 12 SCC 707**, the court held that when a large tract of land is acquired and the sale deed exemplars are produced of the smaller plots, the best course for the court to arrive at a reasonable and fair valuation, is to deduct a reasonable percentage from the valuation shown in the

exemplar land and on the basis thereof to arrive at a fair valuation.

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 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 the fair market value of the acquired land. The court further went on to hold that in a case where the sale exemplar fulfils all the factors, needed to be fulfilled, then there is no reason for not awarding the price similar to the market value as ascertained in the sale deed exemplar. The relevant discussion in 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.

As is evidenced, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down certain tests before the landowners of the acquired land those who claim entitlement to the sale value of the comparable land. First test is with respect to the fact that the sale must be a genuine transaction. In the present case, no evidence has been led to prove that sale exemplar Ex.P3 and P5 (in table 1) are not genuine transactions. Under the second test, the sale exemplar must have been executed at the time proximate to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. In the present case, the time gap between the sale exemplar Ex.P5 and the date of notification under Section 4 is one year. Thus, the sale exemplar Ex.P5 passes this test. The third test is that the land covered by the sale exemplar must be in the vicinity of the acquired land. Both the sale exemplars Ex.P-3 and Ex.P-5 pass this test. As regards, the fourth test, it is evident that the land sold through the sale exemplar Ex.P3 and P5

being in the vicinity was similar to the land acquired. The State has not led any evidence to prove that the land covered by the sale exemplar was different in geographical location or in the quality from the aforesaid acquired land. Hence, test no.4 is also fulfilled by the sale exemplar Ex.P3 and P5 from table no.1. The fifth test is with respect to the size of the plot of the land covered by the sale exemplar. As already noticed, the land sold through the sale exemplar Ex.P3 is more than 7 Acres, which is of a reasonable measurement of a plot of land when compared with the land acquired. As all these tests stand fulfilled, there is no reason to deprive the landowners of the price as ascertained in the sale exemplar Ex.P5 (in table1).

Thus, it is crystal clear that the Hon'ble Supreme Court itself has recognized in more than one judgments that if there is no dissimilarity between the acquired land and the sale exemplar produced which is of a reasonable size/parcel of land, it would not be appropriate for the court to apply proportionate deduction to reduce the value.

The principle underlined by all these judgments is that while assessing the market value, the court is required to apply the wisdom of a common man 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 sales 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, used for residential, commercial or industrial purposes. The deduction can be applied when comparable sale exemplar is of a plot of a smaller 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 (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 some other 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 near residential area or the commercial establishments. There can be more than one reasons to apply the development cut. However, if the price is reduced while assessing the market value of the acquired land, without observing the facts and circumstances of the cases, it would be against the statutory intendment. Section 23 does not provide for any cut or deduction, either on account of development works or development cost. In a case where the court is making an assessment with respect to an undeveloped acquired land as an undeveloped area and the sale exemplar produced for such determination is also of an undeveloped piece of land/agricultural land of reasonable size, then the deduction made on account of development work or development cost, in the considered opinion of this Court, shall not be appropriate. Most of the landowners are farmers. This can be explained by an example. Hypothetically, if a farmer purchases a large chunk of land just before the notification under Section 4. 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, he shall stand deprived of the market value given by him while purchasing the land. It would be against the spirit/intention of the Act. While assessing the market value of the undeveloped/agriculture 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 not be appropriate and justified. The cut/deduction has been applied by the courts in order to arrive at a correct figure representing the market value of the acquired land. This method has been devised by the Court 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 base, makes an attempt to work out the fair market value of the acquired land.

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, he is not being compensated adequately due to the deduction for the development. This cannot be the intention of the legislature. Intention of the Legislature is to make the laws fair and just for the people whose land is taken compulsorily.

Once, a large chunk of agricultural land is being acquired for carving out a residential/commercial or industrial colony and the sale exemplar of plots of reasonable size of agriculture land are available, in the considered opinion of this Court, it would not be appropriate to apply 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 deprived of the land even if such part is being used for providing common facilities. The landowner does not directly gain on account of reservation of land for common facilities. The landowners suffers a double loss. On the one hand, he is deprived of the acquired land whereas on the other hand, he does not get appropriate amount.

There is yet another aspect of the matter. The development agency/organization/colonizer/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 demand and supply. Usually, the plots are sold on the basis of price determined on per sq. feet or per sq. yard. basis and not on per acre. 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. Similarly, the development cost incurred or to be incurred for providing common facilities is also required to be borne by the developer.

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 deprived of the

adequate compensation. 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.

Now coming back to the facts of the case. There is another aspect which needs adjudication. Sh. Narwal has relied upon the award passed by LAC (Ex.P12) which relates to acquisition of land, started by the notification under Section 4 of 1894 issued on 11.01.2010. No doubt, the land is located in the village in question, however, there is no evidence that the relied piece of land is comparable. Moreover, the assessment by the LAC is with respect to 11.01.2010, the period post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, whereas in this batch of cases the crucial date for assessment of price is 13.02.2008. Therefore, Ex.P12 should not be relied upon.

However, there is one more aspect of the matter. Learned counsel representing the landowners have contended that while assessing the market value of the land upto the depth of 1 acre located on the National Highway has been assessed at the rate of Rs.28,69,910/- per acre by this Court in RFA No. 926 of 2017 with respect to acquisition of the land vide notification dated 09.06.2006 under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. In the present case, Sh.Krishan (Patwari) while appearing as a witness on behalf of the HSIIDC has admitted that a land measuring 10 acres is located on the National Highway. It is well known that the land

located on a National Highway fetches a higher price as compared to the parcels of the land located in the interior/ hinterland. The Reference Court has also noticed this distinction while assessing the compensation amount while observing that the market value of land abutting the National Highway being more valuable is assessed at Rs.24,50,000/- per acre.

In the previous batch of appeals i.e RFA-926-2017 the landowners had produced a sale exemplar of land being sold at the rate of Rs.31,88,789/- per acre. In this batch, the reference court has assessed the land located on the National Highway upto the depth of 1 acre @ 24,50,000/- per acre whereas the remaining/ land located in interior has been assessed @ 21,37,000/- per acre. This figure has been arrived at by the Reference Court increasing the basic value by 10%. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the market value of the land on the National Highway upto the depth of 1 acre is increased by 10% over and above Rs.28,08,242/-. Hence, the acquired land abutting the National Highway upto the depth of 1 acre is assessed at the rate of Rs.30,89,662/-.

HSIIDC has filed various writ petitions assailing the correctness of the order passed by the Land Acquisition Collector under Section 28-A of the 1894 Act. It has been contended that the LAC should have waited for the final determination by the Court. As this Court has adjudicated upon the aforesaid issue resulting in increase in the market value payable, therefore, there is no substance in the writ

petitions.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the judgment passed by the Reference Court is modified. It is declared that the landowners of the acquired land situated upto the depth of 1 acre on the National Highway no.10 shall be entitled to be paid the market value at Rs.30,89,066/- per acre whereas the landowners of the remaining land shall be entitled to be paid at the Rs.28,08,242/- per acre which is an increase of Rs.6,71,242/- per acre over and above the assessment made by the Reference Court in respect of parcels of land located beyond the distance of depth equivalent to that of 1 acre. Whereas with respect to parcels of land located upto the depth equivalent to 1 acre, the market value of the acquired land has been increased by Rs. 6,39,066/- per acre over and above the amount awarded by the Reference Court. The landowners shall also be entitled to the aforesaid amount alongwith all the statutory benefits as per the amended 'the 1894 Act'.

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

10.11.2021
rekha
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Sr. No.	Case number	TITLE
1.	RFA-1625-2016	NAFE SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS (MAIN CASE)
2.	CWP-10110-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S JITENDER AND OTHERS
3.	CWP-10118-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

REKHA SIHAG
2022.02.04 14:07
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticiy of this document
Chandigarh

		LTD. V/S SATBIR AND OTHERS
4.	CWP-10126-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S PARVEEN AND OTHERS
5.	CWP-10183-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S NIRMALA AND OTHERS
6.	CWP-10186-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S NARESH AND OTHERS
7.	CWP-10188-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S PREM SINGH AND OTHERS
8.	CWP-10189-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED (HSIIDC) V/S BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS
9.	CWP-10190-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S BIJENDER AND OTHERS
10.	CWP-10192-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. ROSHANI AND OTHERS
11.	CWP-10193-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S KRISHAN AND OTHERS
12.	CWP-10194-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED (HSIIDC) V/S NIRMALA AND OTHERS
13.	CWP-10195-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S NARESH AND OTHERS
14.	CWP-10196-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. KHAZANI DEVI AND OTHERS
15.	CWP-10197-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S PREM SINGH AND OTHERS
16.	CWP-10198-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S SANJAY AND OTHERS
17.	CWP-10199-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SURAT SINGH AND OTHERS
18.	CWP-10200-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S MUKHTIYAR AND OTHERS
19.	CWP-10202-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S SMT. SANTRA AND OTHERS
20.	CWP-10203-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S MURTI DEVI AND OTHERS
21.	CWP-10204-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

		LTD. V/S PREM SINGH AND OTHERS
22.	CWP-10205-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SOM PARKASH BAWA AND OTHERS
23.	CWP-10206-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S KRISHAN AND OTHERS
24.	CWP-10207-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SURAJ BHAN AND OTHERS
25.	CWP-10208-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S DARSHAN KUMAR AND OTHERS
26.	CWP-10209-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S OM PARKASH AND OTHERS
27.	CWP-10210-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SANTRA AND OTHERS
28.	CWP-10211-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S MUKHTIYAR AND OTHERS
29.	CWP-10212-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. SUDESH AND OTHERS
30.	CWP-10214-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SANTRA AND OTHERS
31.	CWP-10215-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S NARESH AND OTHERS
32.	CWP-10216-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL ANDINFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED (HSIIDC) V/S SUMUNDER AND OTHERS
33.	CWP-10217-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S JITENDER AND OTHERS
34.	CWP-10222-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S SUSHILA AND OTHERS
35.	CWP-10224-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S BIJENDER AND OTHERS
36.	CWP-10225-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD V/S DHARAMPAL AND OTHERS
37.	CWP-10524-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. REKHA AND OTHERS
38.	RFA-2579-2016	DAYANAND AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
39.	CWP-12347-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

		LTD. V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
40.	CWP-12378-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SURAJ BHAN AND OTHERS
41.	CWP-12380-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S MUKHTIYAR SINGH AND OTHERS
42.	CWP-12370-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SURAJMAL AND OTHERS
43.	CWP-12382-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S ANAND AND OTHERS
44.	CWP-12383-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
45.	CWP-12384-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S BHIM SINGH AND OTHERS
46.	CWP-12395-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SURAJ BHAN AND OTHERS
47.	CWP-12399-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
48.	CWP-12400-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S ANIL AND OTHERS
49.	CWP-12403-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S DHANPATI AND OTHERS
50.	CWP-12404-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SUKHBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
51.	CWP-12408-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
52.	CWP-12412-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SUKHBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
53.	CWP-12418-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SEHAJ RAM AND OTHERS
54.	CWP-12444-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S KITAB SINGH AND OTHERS
55.	CWP-12451-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SILAK RAM AND OTHERS
56.	CWP-12452-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S MANJEET AND OTHERS
57.	CWP-12455-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

		LTD. V/S BIJENDER AND OTHERS
58.	CWP-12456-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S TARAWATI AND OTHERS
59.	CWP-12461-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. KRISHNA AND OTHERS
60.	CWP-12462-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S OM SINGH AND OTHERS
61.	CWP-12464-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SATTAN KAUR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
62.	CWP-12465-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SURAJMAL AND OTHERS
63.	CWP-12468-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RAMESH AND OTHERS
64.	CWP-12472-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S INDER SINGH AND OTHERS
65.	CWP-12476-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S KAPOOR AND OTHERS
66.	CWP-12479-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. BRAHMO DEVI AND OTHERS
67.	CWP-12483-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RISAL SINGH AND OTHERS
68.	CWP-12488-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S ZILE SINGH AND OTHERS
69.	CWP-12493-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S ZILE SINGH AND OTHERS
70.	CWP-12500-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S KAPOOR AND OTHERS
71.	CWP-12503-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RAM KISHAN AND OTHERS
72.	CWP-12508-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S BALWAN AND OTHERS
73.	CWP-12510-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S ZILE SINGH AND OTHERS
74.	CWP-12516-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S CHATTAR SINGH AND OTHERS
75.	CWP-12523-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND

		INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RAJENDER @ RAJINDER AND OTHERS
76.	CWP-12529-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S OM SINGH AND OTHERS
77.	CWP-12532-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RAJ KANWAR AND OTHERS
78.	CWP-12534-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S BALRAJ SINGH AND OTHER
79.	CWP-12539-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
80.	CWP-12542-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S MUKHTIAR SINGHAND OTHERS
81.	CWP-12547-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RAJBIR AND OTHERS
82.	CWP-12574-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RAJESH AND OTHERS
83.	CWP-12917-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
84.	CWP-12958-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SATTAN KAUR(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
85.	CWP-12959-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S DHARAM SINGH AND OTHERS
86.	CWP-12970-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S JEET RAM @ JOT RAM (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
87.	CWP-12973-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SHRI BHAGWAN AND OTHERS
88.	CWP-12976-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S JOGINDER AND OTHERS
89.	CWP-12982-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S JEET RAM @ JOT RAM (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
90.	CWP-12985-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RAJ KANWAR AND OTHERS
91.	CWP-12993-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S DHANPATI DEVI AND OTHERS
92.	CWP-12997-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

		LTD. V/S RAMESH AND OTHERS
93.	CWP-13062-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
94.	CWP-13155-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S DAYANAND(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
95.	CWP-13170-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S BALWAN SINGH AND OTHERS
96.	CWP-13188-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. PHOOLA AND OTHERS
97.	CWP-13192-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SATTAN KAUR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
98.	CWP-13193-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S JOGINDER SINGH AND OTHERS
99.	CWP-10431-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SMT. INDERAWATI AND OTHERS
100.	CWP-10527-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S NIRMLA AND OTHERS
101.	CWP-10532-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S SAVITRI AND OTHERS
102.	CWP-10534-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S NANHI, AND OTHERS
103.	CWP-12340-2021	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. V/S ANITA AND OTHERS
104.	RFA-1628-2016	SMT. JAGWANTI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
105.	RFA-1629-2016	SMT. CHAND KAUR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
106.	RFA-1630-2016	SATYAWAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
107.	RFA-1631-2016	PARKASH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
108.	RFA-1632-2016	BIJE SINGH(DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
109.	RFA-1633-2016	SATYAWAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
110.	RFA-1634-2016	SMT. BIMLA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
111.	RFA-1635-2016	UMED SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

112.	RFA-1636-2016	PREET SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
113.	RFA-1637-2016	SATYAWAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
114.	RFA-1638-2016	RAGHBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
115.	RFA-1639-2016	DIWANA(DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
116.	RFA-1640-2016	BIJE SINGH(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
117.	RFA-1641-2016	BIJE SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
118.	RFA-1642-2016	DIWANA (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
119.	RFA-1643-2016	PREET SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
120.	RFA-1644-2016	BIJE SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
121.	RFA-1645-2016	PREET SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
122.	RFA-1646-2016	PREET SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
123.	RFA-1647-2016	PREET SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
124.	RFA-2133-2016	SURENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER
125.	RFA-2134-2016	KARTAR SINGH(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
126.	RFA-2135-2016	DHARAMPAL(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
127.	RFA-2136-2016	SURENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER
128.	RFA-2137-2016	RANDHIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER
129.	RFA-2138-2016	BALWAN SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
130.	RFA-2139-2016	SURENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
131.	RFA-2140-2016	SURENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER
132.	RFA-2370-2016	NAFE SINGH & ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
133.	RFA-2371-2016	CHANDER SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
134.	RFA-2372-2016	CHANDER SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
135.	RFA-2373-2016	SHAMSHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
136.	RFA-2374-2016	HUKUM SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
137.	RFA-2375-2016	DHARAMBIR & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA &

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

39

		OTHERS
138.	RFA-2376-2016	SOBHA V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
139.	RFA-2377-2016	SOBHA V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
140.	RFA-2378-2016	BIJENDER SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
141.	RFA-2379-2016	CHANDER SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
142.	RFA-2380-2016	CHANDER SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
143.	RFA-2381-2016	CHANDER SINGH & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
144.	RFA-2382-2016	SHAMSHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
145.	RFA-2515-2016	SARDARA THRO LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
146.	RFA-2575-2016	MAHABIR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
147.	RFA-2576-2016	DAYA RAM (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
148.	RFA-2577-2016	SMT. KRISHNA & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
149.	RFA-2578-2016	SMT. RANI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
150.	RFA-2580-2016	MAHABIR & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
151.	RFA-2581-2016	SMT. MEENA AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
152.	RFA-3819-2016	RAM KUMAR AND OTHERS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
153.	RFA-4293-2016	SMT. HAR KAUR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS& OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
154.	RFA-4294-2016	SMT. HAR KAUR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
155.	RFA-4296-2016	SMT. HAR KAUR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
156.	RFA-4297-2016	SMT. HAR KAUR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
157.	RFA-171-2017	MUKHTIYAR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
158.	RFA-206-2017	SUKHI RAM & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
159.	RFA-1023-2017	SMT. HAR KAUR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
160.	RFA-1099-2017	BALWAN(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER
161.	RFA-1101-2017	CHAND SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER
162.	RFA-5057-2017	SUKHI RAM & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
163.	RFA-127-2018	CHANDER SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHER

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

40

164.	RFA-171-2018	SHANTI (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
165.	RFA-2939-2018	SAMUNDER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
166.	RFA-3636-2018	RAMESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH COLLECTOR ROHTAK AND OTHERS
167.	RFA-3757-2018	SMT. VIDYA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
168.	RFA-3758-2018	SOMVIR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
169.	RFA-4179-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S RAMPHAL AND OTHERS
170.	RFA-4180-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL &INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. BIMLA AND OTHERS
171.	RFA-4181-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL &INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BHOPAL AND OTHERS
172.	RFA-4182-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S CHANDER SINGH AND OTHERS
173.	RFA-4183-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S KARTAR SINGH AND OTHERS
174.	RFA-4184-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SHANTI AND OTHERS
175.	RFA-4185-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SHAMSHER SINGH AND OTHERS
176.	RFA-4187-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DILBAGH SINGH AND OTHERS
177.	RFA-4188-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT.MEHLO DEVI AND OTHERS
178.	RFA-4189-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BIJE SINGH(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
179.	RFA-4190-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORAION AND ANR V/S PREET SINGH AND OTHERS
180.	RFA-4191-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S PARKASH AND OTHERS
181.	RFA-4192-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

41

		PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. HAR KAUR AND OTHERS
182.	RFA-4193-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. CHAND KAUR AND OTHERS
183.	RFA-4194-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S MAHABIR AND OTHERS
184.	RFA-4195-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BHIM SINGH AND OTHERS
185.	RFA-4196-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S HUKAM SINGH AND OTHERS
186.	RFA-4197-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORAION AND ANR V/S BALBIR SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
187.	RFA-4198-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SATYAWAN AND OTHERS
188.	RFA-4199-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S PREET SINGH & OTHERS
189.	RFA-4200-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. HAR KAUR AND OTHERS
190.	RFA-4201-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S KARTAR SINGH AND OTHERS
191.	RFA-4202-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DAYANAND AND OTHERS
192.	RFA-4203-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S CHANDER SINGH AND OTHERS
193.	RFA-4204-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SATYAWAN AND OTHERS
194.	RFA-4205-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. HAR KAUR AND OTHERS
195.	RFA-4206-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL &

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

42

		INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SATYAWAN AND OTHERS
196.	RFA-4207-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR. V/S RAM KUMAR AND OTHERS
197.	RFA-4208-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SHAMSHER AND OTHERS
198.	RFA-4209-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR. V/S SMT. SUNITA AND OTHERS
199.	RFA-4210-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND ANR V/S PREET SINGH AND OTHERS
200.	RFA-4278-2018	MD HSIIDC AND ANR V/S SMT. JAGWANTI AND OTHERS
201.	RFA-4279-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SOMVIR AND OTHERS
202.	RFA-4280-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S RAGHBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
203.	RFA-4281-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S CHAND SINGH (DECEASED)THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
204.	RFA-4282-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORAION AND ANR V/S NAFE SINGH AND OTHERS
205.	RFA-4283-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SURENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
206.	RFA-4284-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S AMIT AND OTHERS
207.	RFA-4285-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S PREET SINGH & OTHERS
208.	RFA-4286-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT.VIDYA AND OTHERS
209.	RFA-4287-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S CHANDER SINGH AND OTHERS
210.	RFA-4288-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

43

		PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DEEP CHAND @ DEEPA AND OTHERS
211.	RFA-4289-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S UMED SINGH & OTHERS
212.	RFA-4290-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DHARAMPAL AND OTHERS
213.	RFA-4291-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S INDER SINGH AND OTHERS
214.	RFA-4292-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORAION AND ANR V/S DIWANA SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
215.	RFA-4293-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SOBHA AND OTHERS
216.	RFA-4294-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S MAHABIR AND OTHERS
217.	RFA-4295-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DAYA RAM AND OTHERS
218.	RFA-4296-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S CHANDER SINGH AND OTHERS
219.	RFA-4297-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. SHANTI AND OTHERS
220.	RFA-4298-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BIJE SINGH(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
221.	RFA-4299-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S PREET SINGH AND OTHERS
222.	RFA-4300-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S PREET SINGH & OTHERS
223.	RFA-4301-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BALWAN SINGH AND OTHERS
224.	RFA-4302-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT.HAR KAUR AND OTHERS
225.	RFA-4303-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL &

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

44

		INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DAYA NAND AND OTHERS
226.	RFA-4304-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BIJE SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
227.	RFA-4305-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S JAI SINGH AND OTHERS
228.	RFA-4306-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DIWANA AND OTHERS
229.	RFA-4307-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S NAFE SINGH AND OTHERS
230.	RFA-4308-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S RAMPHAL AND OTHERS
231.	RFA-4309-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SAMUNDER AND OTHERS
232.	RFA-4310-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S KRISHAN AND OTHERS
233.	RFA-4311-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S CHANDER SINGH AND OTHERS
234.	RFA-4312-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. RANI AND OTHERS
235.	RFA-4313-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SARDARA AND OTHERS
236.	RFA-4314-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S MUKHTIYAR AND OTHERS
237.	RFA-4315-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SUKHI RAM AND OTHERS
238.	RFA-4316-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. CHALTI AND OTHERS
239.	RFA-4317-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

45

		PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. SHANTI AND OTHERS
240.	RFA-4318-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. MEENA AND OTHERS
241.	RFA-4319-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S JAGDISH AND OTHERS
242.	RFA-4320-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S RAMPHAL AND OTHERS
243.	RFA-4321-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S RAMPHAL AND OTHERS
244.	RFA-4322-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BALRAJ AND OTHERS
245.	RFA-4323-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BHULE AND OTHERS
246.	RFA-4324-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SURENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
247.	RFA-4325-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S AMIT AND OTHERS
248.	RFA-4326-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. SHANTI AND OTHERS
249.	RFA-4327-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SHAMSHER AND OTHERS
250.	RFA-4328-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S DHUP SINGH AND OTHERS
251.	RFA-4329-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORAION AND ANR V/S BALBIR SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
252.	RFA-4330-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. SHANTI AND OTHERS
253.	RFA-4331-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S JAI SINGH AND OTHERS
254.	RFA-4332-2018	HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE

RFA-1625-2016 (O&M)
and connected cases

46

		DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SUKHI RAM AND OTHERS
255.	RFA-4333-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SMT. KRISHNA AND OTHERS
256.	RFA-4334-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL & INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S RAMESH AND OTHERS
257.	RFA-5117-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S BIJE SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS AND OTHERS
258.	RFA-5118-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SURENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
259.	RFA-6293-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SOBHA AND OTHERS
260.	RFA-6294-2018	MD HARYANA STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEV CORP PANCHKULA AND ANR V/S SURENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
261.	RFA-1268-2019	RAMPHAL AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS.
262.	RFA-6295-2018	MD HSIIDC AND ANR V/S BIJENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
263.	RFA-556-2019	BHIM SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
264.	RFA-1269-2019	RAMPHAL AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS.
265.	RFA-1270-2019	DEEP CHAND @ DEEPA THROUGH LRS. RAVINDER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS.
266.	RFA-1271-2019	RAMPHAL AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
267.	RFA-1272-2019	RAMPHAL AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
268.	RFA-1788-2019	BALRAJ AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
269.	RFA-1789-2019	PREET SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
270.	RFA-1790-2019	BHOPAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
271.	RFA-2237-2019	JAI SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
272.	RFA-2375-2019	SMT. MEHLO DEVI(DECEASED) THROUGH HER LRS

		AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
273.	RFA-2410-2019	JAGDISH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
274.	RFA-2411-2019	KARTAR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
275.	RFA-2412-2019	JAI SINGH AND OTHERS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
276.	RFA-2413-2019	AMIT AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
277.	RFA-2606-2019	SMT. BIMLA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
278.	RFA-972-2020	INDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
279.	RFA-1031-2020	DHUP SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
280.	RFA-741-2021	BALBIR SINGH NOW DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
281.	RFA-1430-2019	BALBIR SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

10.11.2021
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE