

**RFA-253-2017 (O&M)
and connected cases**

1

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

RFA-253-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.09.2021

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

....Appellants

Versus

Virender Singh and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Ashwani Kumar Chopra, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for HSIIDC.

Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Ashwani Bakshi, Advocate
for the appellants/claimants (in RFA-1923, 1924, 1925,
1926, 2669 and 2686 of 2016)

Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate
for appellants/claimants.

Mr. Dinesh Arora, Advocate
for appellants (in RFA-174 and 175 of 2017)
for respondent (in RFA-256 and 304 of 2017)

Mr. N.C. Kinra, Advocate and
Mr. Harsh Kinra, Advocate
for respondent No.1 (in RFA-318-2017)

Mr.N.K. Malhotra, Advocate
for applicant-respondents. (in RFA-305-2017)

Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate
for the respondents.

Mr. Kartar Singh Malik, Advocate

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

By this order a bunch of 94 appeals, (details whereof are on the foot of the judgment), shall stand disposed of. The learned counsels representing the parties have also stated that these appeals can be conveniently disposed of by a common judgement.

These appeals under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') have been filed while assailing the correctness of the common award passed on 14.10.2015 by the Additional District Judge (Reference Court). The beneficiary of the acquisition i.e., HSIIDC as well as land owners who ultimately ended up losing the land on account of compulsory acquisition thereof, have filed these appeals. The HSIIDC prays for reduction of the market value whereas the land owners pray for enhancement thereof.

Facts:-

The necessary details of the acquisition are extracted as under:-

Date of notification u/s 4	25.1.2006
Village/City, Hadbast No.	Village Kutana District Rohtak
Total Extent acquired	149 acre 0 kanal 15 marla
Purpose of acquisition	For setting up industrial estate, Rohtak to be planned as an integrated complex for industrial and other public utilities etc.
Collector's Award	12.50 lakhs per acre

The crucial date for determination of the market value of the acquired land is 25.01.2006. The Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as LAC) has assessed the market value at

Rs.12,50,000/- per acre. The reference court while assessing the market value, has divided the land into three different categories. First category includes the strip of land upto the depth of 1 acre from National Highway no.10. The market value of such land has been assessed at the rate of Rs.20,00,000/- per acre. In the second category, the land situated on the link metalled road going from Rohtak to Gaddi Kheri upto the depth of 1 acre has been assessed at Rs.18,50,000/- per acre whereas the market rate of the remaining land situated at a distance of more than one acre and in the interior has been assessed at Rs.17,20,000/- per acre. Besides, the aforementioned assessment, the landowners have been held entitled to solatium at the rate of 30% as envisaged under sub-section 23 (2) and an additional amount to be calculated at the rate of 12% per annum from the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act until the date of award in terms of Section 23 (1)(a) of the 1894 Act. The landowners have also been held entitled to the interest on the enhanced compensation at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of taking possession for a period of one year and at the rate of 15% per annum after the expiry of the said period of one year till the date of payment in terms of Section 28 of the Act.

Arguments of learned Counsels representing the parties

Heard the learned counsel for the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paper book. On the one hand, learned counsel representing the HSIIDC contends that the reference court has erred in ignoring the sale exemplars produced by the State on the ground

that the per acre price in those exemplars sale transactions is lower than the amount awarded by the LAC. He, while, drawing the attention of the Court to Section 25 of the 1894 Act contends that the statute prohibits the reference court to pay/assess the amount lower than the amount awarded by the Collector, however, there is no prohibition in taking into consideration the sale exemplars of lower value. He further contends that if sale exemplars Ex.R1 to R4 are taken into consideration, the average price per acre comes to Rs.5,88,209/- and therefore, the LAC was already generous in awarding @ Rs.12,50,000/-per acre. He, while, referring to the sale exemplars Ex.P10, P11 and P12 contends that these plots are of very a tiny size and therefore, could not be relied upon to assess the market value of the agriculture land.

On the other hand, learned counsel representing the owners have contended that the acquired land is situated in an already developed industrial hub and 18 kanal 4 marla land of the village has already come within the municipal limits. They further contend that as the entire land is being acquired for development of integrated complex for industrial and public utilities accordingly, uniform market value be assessed. Sh. Kartar Singh Malik, Advocate, has contended that the belt carved by the reference court should be upto the depth of 2 acres from the road and not restricted to strip of land upto the depth of one acre only. He further drew attention of the court to the application for additional evidence filed in RFA 2363-2016 through which the owner wishes to produce on record the Government policy issued on 9th November, 2010 assessing the market value at Rs.45,00,000/- per acre. Sh. Bakshi contended that

the cut to the extent of 41% applied by the reference court is on the higher side, particularly, when the area has already been developed into an industrial area.

Statutory provisions and the parameters of adjudication:-

While examining the provisions of the 1894 Act, in HSIIDC vs. Balbir Singh and others RFA-4163-2017 decided on 01.09.2021, this Bench after noticing the statutory provision has held as under:-

“4.4 Before this bench examines the contention of the learned counsel representing the parties, it would be appropriate to notice the relevant provisions of the 1894 Act. Section 15 of the 1894 Act provides 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 awarded by the Collector -
The amount of compensation awarded by the Court shall not be less than the amount awarded by the Collector under Section 11.”

4.5 It is apparent from the reading of the first part of Section 23 of the 1894 Act that the market value of the land is required to be determined on the date of publication of the notification under Section 4 (1) of 1894 Act. Hence, the crucial date for determining the market value is 09.06.2006. No further guidelines for assessment of the amount 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 also 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 compulsory nature of the acquisition. Section 24 of the 1894 Act enlists the various factors which are required to be ignored while determining the 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 Collector.

4.6 It is apparent from the 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 existing and potential use. The Court is also required to examine as to whether the acquired land has proximity to the National Highway or the State Highway Road 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. While assessing such compensation, one of the method is to assess the market value by comparable sale method i.e. by referring to contemporaneous transactions.

4.7 While adjudicating the market value of the acquired land, the Courts are expected to award “just” and “appropriate” amount on the basis of the material available on 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 interest of the parties and the public interest, in general. 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 distributing the public money without limits thereby impacting the public interest, at large whereas if the courts are inclined towards the government, it can result in undermining of just claims. 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.”

On a careful perusal of the award and the record of the reference court, it becomes crystal clear that there are two roads pass through the area. One is National Highway no.10, which is abutting the acquired land whereas the other is Rohtak-Gaddi Kheri Road which goes through the land. It has also come in evidence of Jai Karan, an official of HSIIDC that 18 kanal and 4 marla land of the village has already been included in the municipal area before the date of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. He further admits that old Industrial Area is at point 'A' in Ex.R3 which is a revised lay out plan of Kutana Extension Industrial Estate Rohtak. Point 'A' is located just across road

i.e., on the other side of the National Highway no.10. That means, on the one side of the NH-10, there is Old Industrial Area whereas on the other side of the highway is the acquired land. It has also come in evidence and not contested by HSIIDC that there are a number of industries in the already developed Old Industrial Area. Jai Karan has admitted that the area is fully developed and all the facilities are available in the Old Industrial Area. Furthermore, when Brij Bhan appeared as PW3, he has stated that the acquired land is at a distance of about 1 km from new General Bus Stand whereas 4 kms from suncity township. Whereas the location of Pt. B.D.Sharma, PGIMS Rohtak, is 3 kms away from the acquired land. Rohtak Railway Station is 1 ½ kms away from the acquired land. The Cooperative Sugar Mill is located ½ km away from the acquired land. Besides, it has been asserted that there is auto market as well as Laxmi Precision Screws Limited, a very popular industrial house of the area, are located near the acquired land. The correctness of this part of the statement of Brij Bhan has not been challenged in the cross examination. However, these facts are not sufficient to assess the market value.

Now, there are as many as 8 sale exemplars produced by both the parties. A tabulated information thereof is extracted as under:-

Sr. No	Ex.no	Date	Area	Price	Price per acre	Remarks
1	P-9	31-3-2005	2K-7M	4,00,000/-	13,62,702/-	3 rd category shed 10 years old 1900 sq. feet (211.5

						sq. yards)
2.	P-10	30-08-2005	166.66 sq. yard	1,00,000/-	29,09,090/-	Plot no. 104 Southern plot no.105
3.	P-11	16-9-2005	515.83 sq. yards	3,10,000/-	29,17,647/-	2 nd part plot no.11, 14 & 15
4.	P-12	5-10-2005	277.77 sq. yards	1,67,000/-	29,17,978/-	Plot
5.	R-1	19-7-2005	4K	2,75,000/-	5,50,000/-	Kutana
6.	R-2	29-8-2005	8K	4,50,000/-	4,50,000/-	Within MC Kutana
7	R-3	7-10-2005	6K	4,50,000/-	6,00,000/-	Kutana
8	R-4	23-1-2006	2K-10M	2,30,000/-	7,36,000/-	Kutana

In the oral evidence the owners have examined PW1 Om Parkash Draftsman, Nagar Nigam Rohtak, PW2 Manoj Kumar, Patwari, who has proved site plan, PW3 Brij Bhan one of the owners, and PW4 Vineet Kumar Ahuja, one of the landowners. On the other hand, HSIIDC has examined Jai Karan DRA of HSIIDC as RW1.

On careful perusal, it is clear that the owners have produced Ex.P9 to P12, whereas the HSIIDC has produced four sale deeds Ex.R1 to R4. There is a huge variation/difference in the per acre price of these sale deeds. However, the State has failed to produce the evidence to show comparative location of the land covered by sale deeds Ex.R1 to R4 vis-a-vis the acquired land. As already noted the acquired land is situated opposite Old Industrial Area near NH-10. The HSIIDC has produced revised lay out plan Ex.R3, however, the area covered by sale

deeds Ex.R1 to R4 have not been depicted therein. Hence, it would not be appropriate to blindly rely upon the same.

It may be noted here that Ex.P9 is a sale deed of 2 kanals 7 marlas executed on 31.03.2005. This piece of land was sold at Rs.4,00,000/-. The per acre price comes to Rs.13,62,702/-. On careful reading of the sale deed, Ex.P9, it is crystal clear that there was 10 years old 3rd category shed measuring 1900 sq. feet (211 sq. yards) existed on total land of measuring 1420 Sq. Yards approximately (2 Kanal 7 Marlas). This sale deed is 10 months prior to the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The 10 years old shed is stated to be of 3rd category, therefore, the deduction of Rs. 62,702/- towards the cost of construction would be appropriate. If the court having regard to the location of the land, adds 10% in the price of the land due to gap of 10 months in the sale deed Ex.P9, the amount comes to Rs.14,30,000/- per acre.

The remaining sale deeds produced by the owners are with respect to small size plots, either of residential or commercial plots. The reference court has taken the average per acre value of the sale deeds Ex.P10 to P12 and thereafter, applied a cut of 41% towards development cost. In the considered opinion of the court, once owners themselves have relied upon the sale deed Ex. P-9, the Reference Court erred in ignoring the sale deed for assessment of market value of the land which is neither located on NH-10 nor on Rohtak Gaddi Kheri Road. While assessing the market value of the agriculture land, efforts must be made to look for the sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period of

agriculture land and if such a yardstick comparing the respective sale deeds is not available, only then it will be appropriate to rely upon the sale deeds of the residential or commercial of smaller size. The price post the date of notification under Section 4 cannot be taken into consideration in view of provisions of 24 of the 1894 Act. Reliance in this context can be placed on the judgments in **State of Orissa Vs. Brij Lal Misra (1995)5 SCC 203** and **Land Acquisition Officer Vs. Jasti Rohini (1995)1 SCC 717**, respectively. However, the landowners have produced award no.2 dated 09.7.2008 assessing the market value of the land at Rs.25,00,000/- per acre as on 05.02.2008 with respect to the land situated in Village Kutana itself. In RFA-2142-2016, the appellant has produced in additional evidence the award passed by the Reference Court enhancing the market value from Rs.25,00,000/- to Rs.33,75,000/- per acre. The landowners have also relied upon award no. 20 dated 15.02.2012 assessing the land in Village Kutana at the rate of Rs.36,00,000/- per acre with respect to notification dated 09.08.2010 issued under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Thus, it is apparent that the price of the land has been consistently increasing.

Unequivocally, the reference court has erred in keeping the sale deeds Ex.R1 to R5 out of consideration on the ground that the average price depicted in the sale deeds is lower than the rate awarded by the LAC. Section 25 of the 1894 Act, does not prohibit the Court from taking into consideration such sale deeds. It may be noted here that the application for permission to lead the additional evidence in RFA-2363-2016 is allowed and the Government policy issued on 9th

November, 2010 is taken on record. This policy decision is post the date of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, in the present case, and therefore, cannot be relied upon for the purpose of assessing the market value of the land on 25.01.2006. However, such policy will not help the Court to determine the market value as on 25.01.2006, which is the crucial date for determination of the compensation in these cases.

Moreover, this Court does not find it appropriate to adjudicate the market value of the agricultural land while relying upon the sale deeds of residential and commercial plots of very small sizes. Hence the question as to what should be the appropriate percentage cut has become irrelevant.

Now let us examine the arguments of the learned counsel representing the landowners. The first argument is that the strip of prime land should be upto the depth of 2 acres from the National Highway. It may be noted here that in the absence of evidence to support the contention, this Bench does not find it appropriate to interfere with the finding recorded by the Reference Court. The next argument of the learned counsel representing the landowners is to the effect that the landowners are entitled to the best price and therefore, transaction representing the highest value should be preferred. Learned counsel relies upon the judgment passed in **Mehrawal Khewaji Trust (Regd) Faridkot vs. State of Punjab (2012) 2 RCR (Civil) 893** and **Vikas vs. State of Punjab (2011) 4 RCR (Civil) 211**. It may be noted here that

this Bench has already relied upon the transaction representing the highest value. While determining the market value a vast area of agricultural land, it would not be appropriate to rely upon smaller plots used for residential and commercial purpose.

The owners have not led any evidence so as to identify the location of the pieces of land covered by sale deeds Ex.P-10, P-11 and P-12. Although, the owners have produced the lay out plan Ex.P-4, however, they have failed to identify the location of land in Ex.P-10, P-11 and P-13. Still further, in the present case, the total acquisition is of nearly 150 acres. Each acre of land normally consists of 8 kanals land. Each kanal of land has 20 marlas. The normal area of an acre is 4840 sq. yards. Sale deed Ex.P-11 is of an area of less than 1 kanal. As the sale deed Ex.P-9 of a plot of reasonable size, hence, it is being relied upon.

It may be noticed here that learned Senior counsel appearing for the HSIIDC has admitted that the entire amount has already been paid to the land owners. It is left to the State to take a call on the question as to whether it intends to recover the excess amount from the farmers or not as by now, the HSIIDC may have passed on the burden of the amount of enhanced compensation to the allottee of industrial plots. In such eventuality, it may not be appropriate for the HSIIDC to unjustly enrich itself.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court is left with no choice but to interfere in the findings of facts arrived at by the Reference Court. Hence, while maintaining the assessment of the land

located abutting to National Highway and metalled road by the Reference Court, the market value of remaining land is reduced to Rs.14,30,000/- per acre. The market value of the land abutting both the roads is not being disturbed as in those cases sale deeds of residential and commercial small sized plots have been correctly relied upon the Reference Court.

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

28.09.2021
rekha
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party Name
1.1.	RFA-253-2017	HSI IDC V/S VIRENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
2.1.	RFA-255-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAJENDER AND OTHERS
3.1.	RFA-258-2017	HSI IDC V/S DALIP SINGH AND ANOTHER
4.	RFA-466-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAM RATTAN AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-263-2017	HSI IDC V/S SMT. SHARDA AND OTHERS
6.	RFA-265-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAM KUMAR AND OTHERS
7.	RFA-266-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAJENDER AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-267-2017	HSI IDC V/S PAWAN KUMAR AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-269-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAM CHANDER AND OTHERS
10.	RFA-271-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAJ SINGH AND OTHERS
11.	RFA-278-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAJENDER KUMAR AND OTHERS

**RFA-253-2017 (O&M)
and connected cases**

17

12.	RFA-280-2017	HSI IDC V/S KRISHAN PAL SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
13.	RFA-286-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAJENDER KUMAR AND ANOTHER
14.	RFA-292-2017	HSI IDC V/S DALIP SINGH AND OTHERS
15.	RFA-294-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAJENDER SINGH NANDAL AND OTHERS
16.	RFA-295-2017	HSI IDC V/S HARENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
17.	RFA-296-2017	HSI IDC V/S DHARAMBIR AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-298-2017	HSI IDC V/S WAZIR CHAND (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
19.	RFA-300-2017	HSI IDC V/S KULBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-305-2017	HSI IDC V/S SMT. DHANPATI AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-318-2017	HSI IDC V/S RAM AVTAR AND OTHERS
22.	RFA-1115-2018	JAI SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-1266-2021	SUBE SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
24.	RFA-1314-2017	SMT. DEEPIKA V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
25.	RFA-1501-2017	VANEET KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-1517-2017	BUDH RAM AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-1573-2017	CHANDER BHAN (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-1629-2017	SURAJ BHAN (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
29.	RFA-174-2017	MANMOHAN GOYAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
30.	RFA-175-2017	LEELAWATI & OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
31.	RFA-1923-2016	COL. YUDHVIR SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

**RFA-253-2017 (O&M)
and connected cases**

18

32.	RFA-1924-2016	INDERJEET SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
33.	RFA-1925-2016	COL. YUDHVIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
34.	RFA-1926-2016	RANBIR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
35.	RFA-1927-2016	DHARAMVIR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
36.	RFA-2142-2016	AJAY KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
37.	RFA-2312-2016	BRIJ BHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
38.	RFA-2363-2016	SURESH KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
39.	RFA-254-2017	HSIIDC V/S MED SINGH AND OTHERS
40.	RFA-256-2017	HSIIDC V/S SMT. LEELAWATI AND OTHERS
41.	RFA-257-2017	HSIIDC V/S SMT. DEEPIKA AND OTHERS
42.	RFA-259-2017	HSIIDC V/S DHARAMBIR AND OTHERS
43.	RFA-260-2017	HSIIDC V/S SMT. OMI AND OTHERS
44.	RFA-261-2017	HSIIDC V/S OM PARKASH AND OTHERS
45.	RFA-262-2017	HSIIDC V/S BUDH RAM AND OTHERS
46.	RFA-264-2017	HSIIDC V/S SURAJ BHAN (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
47.	RFA-268-2017	HSIIDC V/S JAI SINGH AND ANOTHER
48.	RFA-2686-2016	ANAND SINGH (NOW DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
49.	RFA-270-2017	HSIIDC V/S CHAIN SUKH AND OTHERS
50.	RFA-272-2017	HSIIDC V/S SMT. VED KAUR AND OTHERS
51.	RFA-273-2017	HSIIDC V/S DHARAMVIR AND OTHERS
52.	RFA-274-2017	HSIIDC V/S SUBE SINGH AND OTHERS
53.	RFA-275-2017	HSIIDC V/S COL. YUDHVIR SINGH AND OTHERS
54.	RFA-276-2017	HSIIDC V/S INDERJEET SINGH AND OTHERS

**RFA-253-2017 (O&M)
and connected cases**

19

55.	RFA-277-2017	HSIIDC V/S ANIL KUMAR (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
56.	RFA-279-2017	HSIIDC V/S ANAND SINGH AND OTHERS
57.	RFA-281-2017	HSIIDC V/S RANBIR SINGH THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
58.	RFA-282-2017	HSIIDC V/S BRIJ BHAN AND OTHERS
59.	RFA-283-2017	HSIIDC V/S RAJ KUMAR AND OTHERS
60.	RFA-284-2017	HSIIDC V/S RAJ KUMAR AND OTHERS
61.	RFA-285-2017	HSIIDC V/S SHEELA AND OTHERS
62.	RFA-287-2017	HSIIDC V/S RAJINDER AND OTHERS
63.	RFA-288-2017	HSIIDC V/S AJAY KUMAR AND OTHERS
64.	RFA-289-2017	HSIIDC V/S SURAT SINGH AND OTHERS
65.	RFA-290-2017	HSIIDC V/S COL. YUDHVIR SINGH AND OTHERS
66.	RFA-291-2017	HSIIDC V/S RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
67.	RFA-293-2017	HSIIDC V/S SMT. LACHMI AND OTHERS
68.	RFA-297-2017	HSIIDC V/S KRISHAN AND OTHERS
69.	RFA-299-2017	HSIIDC V/S RAJBIR AND OTHERS
70.	RFA-301-2017	HSIIDC V/S SURENDER KUMAR AND OTHERS
71.	RFA-302-2017	HSIIDC V/S CHANDER BHAN NOW DECEASED THRO HIS LRS AND ANOTHER
72.	RFA-303-2017	HSIIDC V/S VANEET KUMAR AND OTHERS
73.	RFA-304-2017	HSIIDC V/S MAN MOHAN GOYAL AND OTHERS
74.	RFA-306-2017	HSIIDC V/S VIKAS AND OTHERS
75.	RFA-307-2017	HSIIDC V/S VIKAS AND OTHERS
76.	RFA-3298-2018	KRISHAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
77.	RFA-3528-2017	MED SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR (DRO) ROHTAK THROUGH COLLECTOR ROHTAK

**RFA-253-2017 (O&M)
and connected cases**

20

78.	RFA-3529-2017	VIKAS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
79.	RFA-3530-2017	VIKAS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
80.	RFA-400-2017	HSIIDC V/S BALBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
81.	RFA-4136-2017	VIKAS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
82.	RFA-4137-2017	VIKAS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
83.	RFA-5213-2018	VIRENDER SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
84.	RFA-554-2017	HSIIDC V/S SAHAJ RAM AND OTHERS
85.	RFA-912-2018	RANBIR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
86.	RFA-913-2018	OM PARKASH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
87.	RFA-914-2018	ANIL KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
88.	RFA-915-2018	RAJINDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
89.	RFA-916-2018	DHARAMBIR AND OTHERS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
90.	RFA-917-2018	SURAT SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
91.	RFA-918-2018	SHEELA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
92.	RFA-936-2016	DALIP SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
93.	RFA-937-2016	KULBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
94.	RFA-2669-2016	SMT. LACHMI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS