IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RFA-3240-2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.12.2021

Satpal

....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. S.P. Chahar, Advocate
Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate
Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate
for the landowners.

Mr. Deepak Thapar, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA-13551-2018.

Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA Nos.5902 to 5907, 6301 of 2015 and
RFA No.2020 of 2019.

Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate
for the appellants in RFA Nos.3228, 3231, 3234, 3235, 3236 and 3237 of 2015 and RFA No.1919 of 2016.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana.

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

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. This batch of Regular First Appeals have been filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to the '1894 Act') the details whereof are on the foot of the judgment, assailing the correctness of the identical awards passed by the Reference Court on 21.03.2015 and 20.11.2017 respectively. It is noted here that as many as 59 reference petitions were decided by the Reference Court on

21.03.2015 whereas a few other reference petitions were decided separately vide judgment dated 20.11.2017. However, the conclusion arrived at by both the courts with regard to the assessment of the market value is identical.

2. The important detail, of the acquisition, are as under:-

Date of notification	13.12.2008
Village/Hadbast No.	Village Kharawar, Tehsil Sampla, District Rohtak/Hadbast No.40
Total land acquired	129 Acre 3 kanal
Purpose of land acquisition	For setting up of the Industrial Model Township, Rohtak, to be planned and developed as integrated complex for industrial, transport and other public utilities in Village Kharawar, Tehsil Sampla, District Rohtak.
Collector's Award	Rs.16,00,000/- per acre

3. The Reference Court has reassessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.18,81,200/- per acre by applying a deduction at the rate of 60% on the price reflected in the sale exemplars Ex.P1 and Ex.P2.

4. The landowners have claimed that the acquired land has the potential to be used for commercial, residential and industrial purposes. It has been alleged that the acquired land is situated near Rohtak Delhi National Highway No.10. The Asthal Bohar Railway Station and the Dilyar Lake, Rohtak, are very close to the acquired land. The educational institutions namely Shree Baba Mast Nath College of Engineering, an Eye hospital, an Ayurvedic College, a College of pharmacy, a college of physiotherapy, Shri Baba Mast Nath Residential Public School, Indus Public School, DGV Public School and DAV Centiliary Public School, Rohtak, are also adjacent to the acquired land. It has further been pleaded that the residential colonies namely the Government Employees

Cooperative Housing Society Limited, Suncity project, Omaxe Project and Sector 27 are also located nearby. The landowners claimed that the market value of the land, on the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, was not less than Rs.5 crores per acre.

5. On the other hand, while contesting the petitions, the HSIIDC has claimed that the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as 'the LAC') is just, fair and adequate and in accordance with law.

6. The Reference Court, on appreciation of pleadings framed the following issues:-

> "1. Whether the petitioners are entitled to enhanced compensation as claimed in their petitions. OPP.
> 2. Whether the petitions are not maintainable?OPR.
> 3. Whether the petitions are bad for non-joinder and mis-joinder of necessary parties?OPR.
> 4. Whether the petition is barred by limitation?OPR
> 5. Whether the petition is false, frivolous and malafide? OPR
> 6. Relief."

7. The landowners, in order to prove their case, have examined Rajbir Singh, Registration Clerk, from the office of the Sub Registrar, Sonepat, as PW1, Dharam Kaur, wife of Chander Bhan, as PW2, Mahabir Singh, Nambarardar of village Kharawar, as PW3, Vijay Kumar, Kanungo, in the office of District Revenue Officer-cum- Land Acquisition Collector, Rohtak, as PW4, Paras Ram s/o Maya Chand Pw5 and Rajbir Singh, Registration Clerk was examined, again, as PW6. On the other hand, HSIIDC has examined Krishan Kumar, Patwari as DW1. In both the petitions, which were separately decided, the following sale exemplars were produced by both the parties:-

Table A

The sale exemplars submitted in the court of Learned Additional District Judge in the reference petitions decided on 21.03.2015 (Batch I)

Sr No.	Exhibit No.	Date of Sale Deed	Area	Land Calculated in Marlas	Total Price	Price Per Acre	Village	Type of Land
1	P-1/ P-6	16.04.2007	1K-7M	27	806400	4778667	Kharwar	Not mentioned
2	P-2/ P-5	25.05.2007	32K-5M	645	19349760	4799940	Kharwar	Nehri
3	P-4	20.10.2009	7K-15M	155	6300000	6503225	Kharwar	Not mentioned
4	P-7	22.02.2010	4K-16M	96	2100000	3500000	Kharwar	Chahi/ Nehri
5	P-8	22.09.2009	1A-3K-4M	224	4900000	3500000	Kharwar	Chahi/Nehri
6	P-9	16.12.2009	1A-3K-16M	236	10620625	7200423	Kharwar	Not mentioned
7	R-2	30.10.2006	31K-16M	636	2075000	522012	Kharwar	Nehri
8	R-3	24.03.2008	1 Acre	160	1000000	1000000	Kharwar	Chahi/Nehri
9	R-4	11.08.2006	31K-16M	636	1990000	500628	Kharwar	Not mentioned

Table B

The sale exemplars submitted in the court of Learned Additional District Judge in the reference petitions decided on 20.11.2017 (Batch III)

Sr No	Exhibit No.	Date of Sale Deed	Area	Land Calculated in Marlas	Total Price	Price Per Acre	Village	Type of Land
10	P-2	02.11.2012	1A-3K-7M	227	23877562	16829999	Kheri Sadh	Chahi /Nehri
11	P-3 same as Sr.no.3 in Table A	20.10.2009	7K-15M	155	6300000	6503225	Kharawar	Not mentioned
12	P-4 same as Sr.No.2 in Table A	25.05.2007	32K-5M	645	19349760	4799940	Kharawar	Nehri
13	R-2	03.08.2009	1A-4K	240	1800000	1200000	Kharawar	Nehri/ Chahi
14	R-3	26.02.2010	1 Acre	160	1300000	1300000	Kharawar	Nehri Chahi
15	R-4	01.12.2008	3K-2M	62	684623	1766769	Kharawar	Nehri/ Chahi
16	R-5 same as sr.no.8 in Table 'A'	24.03.2008	1 acre	160	1000000	1000000	Kharawar	Chahi /Nehri

8. Apart from the sale deeds, the owners have also relied upon the award no.19 of 2012-13 passed by District Revenue Officer-Land Acquisition Collector, Rohtak, with respect to the acquisition of land in village Kharawar, Tehsil Sampla, District Rohtak. The proceedings for acquisition of the land, in the aforesaid award, were initiated on 11.01.2010 by issuance of a notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The LAC has assessed the market value of the acquired land at Rs.33,00,000/- per acre. Apart therefrom, various small lay out plans have also been produced which have been derived from the revenue layout plan of the village.

9. Heard the learned counsel representing the parties and with their able assistance perused the judgments passed by the Reference Court alongwith the records with respect to both the awards passed by the Reference Court.

10. The learned counsel representing the appellants contend that the Reference Court has committed a calculation error while taking the average per acre price to be Rs.47,03,000/- whereas the amount comes to Rs.47,89,300/-. They further submit that Ex.P1 and P2 are with respect to the period between April and May, 2007 whereas the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued on 13.02.2008, however, the Reference Court failed to hike the price for the time gap. They further contend that the Reference Court has erred in making a deduction of 60%, from the average per acre price of Ex.P1 and P2, such a deduction being on the higher side.

11. Per contra, learned counsel representing the HSIIDC, the beneficiary Corporation (hereinafter referred to as 'the Corporation') has submitted that the sale exemplars produced by the State have not been

discussed by the Reference Court. He submits that a deduction of 60% of the amount is in accordance with the well settled law.

12. Before this Court proceeds to examine the various respective contentions of the learned counsel representing the parties, it will be appropriate to take a note of the relevant statutory provisions for the determination of the market value. Hence, Section 23, 24 and 25 of the 1894, Act are extracted as under:-

> "**23. Matters to be considered in determining compensation (1**) In determining the amount of compensation to be awarded for land acquired under this Act, the Court shall take into consideration—
>
> first the market-value of the land at the date of the publication of the [notification under Section 4, sub-section (1)
>
> secondly the damage sustained by the person interested, by reason of the taking of any standing crops or trees which may be on the land at the time of the Collector's taking possession thereof;
>
> thirdly the damage (if any) sustained by the person interested, at the time of the Collector's taking possession of the land, by reason of severing such land from his other land;
>
> fourthly the damage (if any) sustained by the person interested, at the time of the Collector's taking possession of the land, by reason of the acquisition injuriously affecting his other property, movable or immovable, in any other manner, or his earnings;
>
> fifthly if, in consequence of the acquisition of the land by the Collector, the person interested is compelled to change his residence or place of business, the reasonable expenses (if any) incidental to such change, and
>
> sixthly the damage (if any) *bona fide* resulting from diminution of the profits of the land between the time of the publication of the declaration under Section 6 and the time of the Collector's taking possession of the land.
>
> [(1-A) In addition to the market-value of the land, as above provided, the Court shall in every case award an amount calculated at the rate of twelve per centum per annum of such market-value for the period commencing on and from the date of the publication of the notification under Section 4, sub-section (1), in respect of such land to the date of the award of the

Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier.

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

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

24. Matters to be neglected in determining compensation -But the Court shall not take into consideration—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

______**25 Amount of compensation awarded by court not to be lower than the amount award by the Collector -** The amount of compensation awarded

> by the Court shall not be less than the amount awarded by the Collector under Section 11."

13. Further, while deciding **Jai Singh vs. State of Haryana (RFA-3000-2016)** and other connected appeals on 15.11.2021, arising from the acquisition of land in village Bohar, which was also acquired under the same notification dated 13.02.2008 for developing the area into an industrial model township and which, in fact, is a nearby village, this Court, after examining in-depth the judgments passed by the various Courts in this regard, has deliberated on the issue of deduction on account of various factors. The relevant discussion is extracted as under:-

> 7.2 Let us first examine the statutory provisions. It is clear that the Legislature never intended that the Court must apply a cut/deduction in each and every case. Rather, it has been laid down that while acquiring the land, the landowners, who stand deprived of the property against their wishes, shall be held entitled to a sum of 30% on such market value in lieu of the compulsory and involuntary nature of acquisition. In common legal parlance, this amount is called solatium. This part of the amount is in the nature of compensation to the owner for depriving him of his property without his consent.
>
> 7.3 to 7.12 xxxxx
>
> 7.13 Thus, it is apparent 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 is of a reasonable size, then, it shall not be appropriate for the court to apply proportionate deduction to reduce the market value.
>
> 7.14 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 or are being used for residential, commercial or industrial purposes. The deduction can be applied when

comparable sale exemplar is of a plot of a very small size as compared to the acquired land in order to moderate the difference between wholesale and retail prices as observed by the Supreme court in judgment passed in ***LaL Chand (supra)***. The appropriate percentage of cut can also be applied if the sale exemplar is of a plot which was being used or was capable of being used for different purposes like residential, commercial or industrial. The development cut can also be applied when the comparable sale exemplar is of a plot which is located at a key position like near the road, market, developed residential colony or commercial establishments. There can be more than one reasons to apply the development cut. However, if the price is reduced while assessing the market value of the acquired land, without observing the aforesaid principles while making the deduction in the facts and circumstances of the individual cases, it shall be against the statutory intendment. In a case where the court is making an assessment with respect to an undeveloped acquired land as an undeveloped area and the sale exemplar produced for such determination is also of an undeveloped piece of land of reasonable size, then any deduction which is made on account of development work or development cost, in the considered opinion of this Court, shall not be considered appropriate. This can be explained by an example. Hypothetically, if a farmer purchases a sufficiently large chunk of land just before the notification under Section 4. On the acquisition of the land purchased, he is likely to produce the sale exemplar of the land purchased by him. If the court treats the sale exemplar as the base value and thereafter applies a cut or deduction on account of development cut or development cost per se, he shall stand deprived of the market value paid by him while purchasing the land. It would be against the spirit/intention of the Act. While assessing the market value of the undeveloped/agricultural land, the court is not required to work out the market value of the developed land or plot. In such circumstances, the application of development cut in the considered opinion of the court would not be appropriate and justified. The cut/deduction is applied by the courts in order to arrive at a correct figure representing the true market value of the acquired land on the relevant date. This method has been devised by the Courts in order to tide over the situations where exactly comparable sale exemplars of contemporaneous period are not available. The court, while making adjustments or treating the prices of the developed plots of smaller size as the base, endeavours to work out the fair market value of the acquired land.

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

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

7.17 There is yet another aspect of the matter. The development agency /organization/ colonizer or the government do not sell the developed plots on the market value assessed by the court. The plots are sold while determining price on basis of the 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 and not the landowner. Therefore, in the considered view of this Court, the development cost incurred or to be incurred for providing common facilities is also required to be borne by the developer.

7.18 It is well settled that while assessing the market value, the court is required to adopt a pragmatic approach. The landowners who stand deprived of the property cannot be permitted to be denied of an adequate and just compensation as well. This is the responsibility of the courts to see that the landowners are adequately compensated. The learned counsel representing the parties have failed to draw

> the attention of the court to any precedent which lays down that while assessing the market value, the application of development cut or deduction on the base value is mandatory."

14. Now, the Bench proceeds to examine the position in the present cases. The parties have not produced any layout plan while identifying the location of the acquired land viz-a-viz the land transacted through the various sale exemplars, which would have made the job of the Court comparatively convenient. However, in the absence thereof, the court is required to decide the case on the basis of the material produced. It is evident from careful examination of the sale deeds Ex.P1 (16.04.2007) and P2 (25.05.2007), in Table A on page 4, that the land measuring 32 kanals and 12 marlas out of the land comprised in Rect.no.35 Killa no. 13, 14, 17, 18, 19 and 22 has been purchsed by Radha Swami Satsang Beas. In both the sale deeds, the vendee is common. Through both the sale deeds, 1 kanal and 7 marlas and 32 kanals 5 marlas of land has been purchased at the rate of Rs.47,78,667/- and Rs.47,99,940/- per acre, respectively. Both these sale deeds are with respect to land located near the National Highway which would be evident from a careful examination of Ex.P12, the layout plan.

15. As regards the potential of the land to be utilized for residential, commercial and industrial purposes, learned counsel representing the respondent does not dispute this fact. It is evident that the State of Haryana itself has acquired the land for industrial purposes. The first acquisition for this purpose, was initiated vide notification dated 13.02.2008 which resulted in acquisition of 129 acres and 3 kanals of land. Thereafter, vide notification dated 11.01.2010, more than 2356 kanals of land was, again, acquired. The award with regard to

notification dated 11.01.2010 was announced on 04.01.2013 assessing the market value at the rate of Rs.33 lakhs per acre.

16. There is no dispute about the existence of various educational institutions and other buildings in and around the acquired area, however, that itself is not sufficient to assess the market value of the acquired land.

17. Since a proper layout plan, as already noticed, has not been prepared or produced, therefore, this Court has carefully examined the sale deeds Ex.P1 (16.04.2007) and Ex.P2 (25.05.2007), alongwith the award no.14 dated 30.11.2009 (Ex.R8). From a careful perusal of the description of the acquired land in the award, it is evident that the land comprised in Rectangle No.2, 3, 4, 9, 10,11, 12, 17, 18, 19 and 36 has been acquired. At this stage, it is appropriate to note the meaning of the different expressions employed while referring to the size of the unit of an agricultural land.

1 Rectangle	=	5 X 5 = 25 Acre (Rectangular shape)
1 Acre (Rectangular shape)	=	160 Marlas
8 Kanal	=	1 Acre
1 Kanal	=	20 Marlas
1 Acre	=	4840 Sq. Yards
1 Marla	=	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
'//'	=	Rectangle
'/'	=	Killa/acre/khasra number

18. During the consolidation of the land holdings in the villages

under the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act 1953, the total land of the village is divided into Rectangles which consistsw of 25 acres of land. Each Rectangle is assigned a numerical number starting from 1. As per practice, which is uniformly followed, Rectangle No.1 is assigned to North Eastern Corner of the village and the assigned number increase in a strip of land having depth, equivalent to 5 acres towards South Eastern boundary of the village, then the assigned numbers keep increasing from the South Eastern side of the village towards the North Eastern side, again, in a strip of land having depth of 5 acres abutting the previous strip of land towards the Western side of the previous strip of land. (In other words, the assigned Rectangle numbers increase in spirral manner similar to the numbers assigned to each box in the game of Snakes and Ladder.)

19. The sale exemplars Ex.P1 (16.04.2007) and Ex.P2 (25.05.2007) in Table 'A' are with respect to two contiguous parcels of land comprised in Rect. No.35 whereas some part of the land acquired falls in Rectangle no.36. Thus, it can be safely concluded that the land acquired in the aforesaid sale deeds/sale exemplars is nearby. The Reference Court has also found that the sale exemplars Ex.P1 (16.04.2007) and Ex.P2 (25.05.2007) are of the contemporaneous period and can be relied upon, whereas, the other sale deeds Ex.P4, P7, P8, P9 in Table A and R3, P2, P3, R2, R3, R4 and R5 as shown in Table B produced are post the date of notification under Section 4. Thus, the most appropriate sale exemplars are Ex.P1 (16.04.2007) and Ex.P2 (25.05.2007). It is noted here that Ex.P1 and P2 have been marked twice. Therefore, Ex.P-1 and P-6 in Table A are one and the same document, whereas, ExP-2 and Ex.P-5 in Table A are also one and the same

document. It is noted here that Ex.P2 in Table A is also same as P-4 in Table B.

20. Now, the Bench proceeds to examine the sale exemplars produced by the HSIIDC. Ex.R-2 and Ex.R3 from Table 'B' are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The sale exemplars Ex.R2 and R4 from Table 'A' are with respect to the same piece of land. Through these sale deeds, the land comprised in Rectangle No.135, 138 and 155 have been sold. The land acquired is comprised in Rectangle No.2, 3, 4, 10, 11,17, 18, 19 and 36. In the sale exemplar Ex.R-3 (in Table 'A') the Rectangle/Killa numbers of the land have not been specified. Hence, in the absence of evidence to prove its comparable geographical location, the same cannot be relied upon to determine the market value of the acquired land. Sale exemplar Ex.R4 (in table 'B') is with respect to a parcel of land in Rectangle No.18. It is with respect to a small piece of land and hence, cannot be relied upon. Further, the sale exemplars produced by the HSIIDC are with respect to the land located at a distance. Hence, the sale exemplars produced by the HSIIDC cannot be relied upon for assessing the market value of the acquired land.

21. Now, the crucial question is that what should be the deduction from the base value. Since Ex.P1 and P2, co-jointly, are with respect to a sufficiently large area and the agricultural land has been purchased by a religious organization, therefore, it would not be appropriate to assess the market value, without applying any deduction, particularly when it is apparent from a careful perusal of the lay out plan Ex.P14, that the land purchased by P1 and P2 is very close to the National Highway No.10 On a careful reading of the statement of Sh.Krishan (Patwari), it is evident that he has admitted that the land

purchased by Radha Swami Satsang Beas is located at 500 metres distance from the acquired land wherein some part of the acquired land is located on the National Highway, whereas, the remaining part lies in the interiors. He further admits that the outer ring road of Rohtak city has been constructed on this land.

22. It is well settled that a parcel of land located on a National Highway fetches more price as compared to the parcel of land located in the interior. Once Krishan (Patwari) has admitted that some part of the acquired land is on the National Highway No.10, then, a deduction of 10% is held appropriate and fair, on the average price of Ex.P1 and P2 which is Rs.47,99,086/- per acre (rounded off to the nearest rupee) as calculated by this Court. Thus, the amount after deduction, comes to Rs.43,19,178/-per acre.

23. It is evident from the aforesaid discussion that the acquisition is for developing the land into an industrial model township, therefore, the land required to be utilized for roads, passages, drains, etc. would be much less when compared to the land required for a residential or commercial colony. Thus, in these circumstances, it is considered appropriate to deduct 20% of the amount from the average price of Ex.P1 and P2, i.e Rs.47,99,086/- per acre (rounded off to the nearest rupee) which after 20% deduction comes to Rs.38,39,269/- per acre(rounded off to the nearest rupee) for the land located in the interior. The learned counsel representing the appellant has contended that the court has failed to hike the price on account of the time gap between the sale exemplars and the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. In the present case, there is a time gap of 8 months and 21 days and about 10 months from the execution of Ex.P1 and P2, respectively. Ordinarily, in

an industrial area, the prices increase at the rate of 10% per annum. Thus, the figure arrived at, is to be increased by 7.5%. Hence, the market value is assessed at Rs.46,43,116/-per acre (rounded off to the nearest rupee) for the land located upto the depth of 1 acre on the National Highway and at Rs.41,27,214/- per acre (rounded off to the nearest rupee) for the land located in the interior.

24. Accordingly, the appeals filed by the landowners are allowed.

02.12.2021 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
rekha **JUDGE**
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

S.No	RFA No. & Year	Party name
1	RFA-3240-2015	SATPAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
2	RFA-3228-2015	MAHABIR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANR
3	RFA-3231-2015	YOGESH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
4	RFA-3234-2015	MAHABIR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANR
5	RFA-3235-2015	MAHABIR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANR
6	RFA-3236-2015	CHANDRAM AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANR
7	RFA-3237-2015	MAHAVIR AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANR
8	RFA-3241-2015	BHARPAI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
9	RFA-3242-2015	RAMESHWAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
10	RFA-3243-2015	RAM KISHAN TH LR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
11	RFA-3244-2015	BHARPAI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
12	RFA-4466-2015	MOJI RAM & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
13	RFA-5356-2015	RAJ KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
14	RFA-5370-2015	DHARAM KAUR V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
15	RFA-5902-2015	SUBE SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
16	RFA-5903-2015	UMED SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
17	RFA-5904-2015	RAJENDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
18	RFA-5905-2015	CHHOTO DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
19	RFA-5906-2015	HAR KISHAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
20	RFA-5907-2015	AMIT KUMAR AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
21	RFA-6144-2015	SURAJMAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
22	RFA-6301-2015	RAM DHAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
23	RFA-1919-2016	CHALTI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

24	RFA-2468-2017	BHAGAT SINGH AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
25	RFA-3366-2018	KITABO AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-13551-2018	M/s Simran Relators Pvt. Ltd. Rohtak vs. State of Haryana and others
27.	RFA-2020-2019	Om Parkash and others vs. State of Haryana and others
28.	RFA-4605-2018	Dayanand (since deceased) through L.Rs and others vs. State of Haryana and others

02.12.2021 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
rekha **JUDGE**