

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 30 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 27.10.2021

Balwan and Others

... Appellant(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Puneet Jindal, Senior Advocate
with Mr. S.P.Chahar, Advocate
for the appellant(s) (In RFA-4537 to 4557, 4835 to 4847, 4851
and 7852 of 2016, RFA-10 to 15, 17 to 23, 28 to 42 and 730 of
2017, RFA-2685, 3594 and 5049 of 2018).

Mr. Puneet Bali, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Gursher Bhandal, Advocate
for the appellant(s) (In RFA-4825-2016).

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

Mr. M.S.Rana, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate
for respondent No.7,

Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate.

Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate.

Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate.

Mr. N.K.Malhotra, Advocate.

Mr. Sudhir Kumar Hooda, Advocate.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana and Ms. Vibha Tiwari, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. Through this batch of appeals, detail whereof is on the foot of the judgment, the owners assail the correctness of the common award dated 26.05.2016 passed by the Reference Court while deciding the various reference petition filed under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1894 Act”). The learned counsels representing the parties are *ad idem* that these appeals can be disposed of by a common judgment.
2. The details of the acquisition are as under:-

<i>Date of Notification U/s 4</i>	<i>13.2.2008</i>
<i>Total Extent acquired</i>	<i>713 Acre 2 Kanal 5 Marla located in the village Baliyana</i>
<i>Purpose of acquisition</i>	<i>Setting up of Industrial Model Township, Rohtak.</i>
<i>Collector’s Award</i>	<i>Rs.16,00,000/- per acre</i>

3. FACTS

3.1 At the outset, it is pertinent to note that this Court, vide a judgment dated 01.09.2021 in “***Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation v. Kulbir and Others***” (***Regular First Appeal No. 4163 of 2017*** along with the other connected appeals), has already decided a previous batch of the appeals with regard to the acquisition of the land in the same village Baliyana initiated vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 09.06.2006. The award passed by the Reference Court, assessing the market value of the acquired land as on 09.06.2006 @

3.2 In this batch of appeals, the Haryana Government, as already noticed, had issued the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 13.02.2008 for utilizing the land for setting up the Industrial Model Township, Rohtak. The Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as “the LAC”) vide an award No.3 dated 06.07.2009 had assessed and offered the market value of the acquired land @ ₹16,00,000/- per acre for all kinds of the land along with all the statutory benefits.

3.3 The landowners, who stood deprived of their land due to its compulsory acquisition, applied to the Collector for forwarding references to the Reference Court. The Reference Court consolidated all the references arising from the land acquired through a common notification. During the pendency of the reference applications, M/s Maruti Suzuki India Limited was also impleaded as a party (respondent).

3.4 The Reference Court, on appreciation of the pleadings, 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? OPP
2. Whether the petitioners are entitled to any amount of enhanced compensation, as alleged, if so to what extent? OPP
3. Whether the petition is not maintainable? OPR
4. Whether the petitioners have no locus standi to file the present petition? OPD
5. Whether the petition is bad for non-joinder and mis-

joinder of necessary parties? OPR

6. *Relief*".

3.5 The landowners, in order to prove their case, examined the various landowners namely Shishpal, Rekha and Kamlesh as PW.1, PW.3 and PW.4, respectively. Sh.Ram Dhan, a retired Kanungo, was examined as PW.2. The landowners, apart from the oral evidence, produced the following documents in evidence:

<i>Ex.P1</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 33 dated 6.4.2007</i>
<i>Ex.P2</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 682 dated 26.6.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P3</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 2147 dated 6.10.2009</i>
<i>Ex.P4</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 710 dated 1.7.2010</i>
<i>Ex.P5</i>	<i>Copy of Award No. 3 dated 6.7.2009</i>
<i>Ex.P6</i>	<i>Copy of Award No. 4 dated 13.7.2009</i>
<i>Ex.P7</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 5626 dated 27.9.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P8</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 3088 dated 3.7.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P9</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 2389 dated 12.4.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P10</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 5095 dated 7.9.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P11</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 14133 dated 13.3.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P12</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 3089 dated 3.7.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P13</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 3090 dated 3.7.2006</i>
<i>Ex.P14</i>	<i>Aks-Shizra</i>
<i>Ex.P15</i>	<i>Copy of Award No. 3 of 6.7.2009</i>

<i>Ex.P16</i>	<i>Notice under Section 9 of the Act</i>
<i>Ex.P17</i>	<i>Copy of Mutation No. 5315</i>
<i>Ex.P18</i>	<i>Copy of Jamabandi for the year 2003-2004</i>
<i>Ex.P19</i>	<i>Notice under Section 9 of the Act</i>
<i>Ex.P20</i>	<i>Copy of Mutation No. 5316</i>
<i>Ex.P21</i>	<i>Copy of Mutation No. 5315</i>

3.6 The Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as “the Corporation”) examined Krishan Kumar, Patwari, as RW.1. M/s Maruti Suzuki Limited examined Surinder Kumar as RW.2. The respondents produced and proved the following documents in their evidence:-

<i>Ex.R1</i>	<i>Authority Letter issued by Dy.Gen.Manager, IMT, Rohtak in favour of Krishan, Patwari</i>
<i>Ex.R2</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 170 dated 23.4.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R3</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 2019 dated 18.1.2008</i>
<i>Ex.R4</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 2371 dated 17.3.2008</i>
<i>Ex.R5</i>	<i>Supplementary Award No. 8 of 4.2.2011</i>
<i>Ex.R6</i>	<i>Supplementary Award No. 8A of 11.4.2012</i>
<i>Ex.R7</i>	<i>Notification No. 5451-R-V-2007/13258 dated 7.12.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R8</i>	<i>Copy of Award No. 3 of 6.7.2009</i>
<i>Ex.R9</i>	<i>Statement No. 19</i>
<i>Ex.R10</i>	<i>Village and Skill Development Scheme for villagers, whose land has been acquired</i>

<i>Ex.R2/1</i>	<i>Power of Attorney in favour of Surender Kumar to appear on behalf of respondent No.4</i>
<i>Ex.R2/2</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 1236 dated 24.6.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R2/3</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 1245 dated 24.8.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R2/4</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 1319 dated 31.8.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R2/5</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 1201 dated 17.8.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R2/6</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 70 dated 11.4.2008</i>
<i>Ex.R2/7</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 1956 dated 31.12.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R2/8</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 160 dated 2.5.2008</i>
<i>Ex.R2/9</i>	<i>Sale Deed No. 1955 dated 31.12.2007</i>
<i>Ex.R2/10</i>	<i>Aks-Shizra</i>
<i>Ex.R2/11</i>	<i>Regular Letter of Allotment</i>
<i>Ex.R2/12</i>	<i>Conveyance Deed</i>

3.7 The Reference Court, found out that Ex.P1 (sale exemplar) is the most appropriate document to assess the market value. The Reference Court, after treating the aforesaid sale exemplar to be the base price on 06.04.2007, hiked the market value price by giving increase of 9% per annum for a period of ten months to arrive at a figure of ₹21,50,000/- per acre as on 13.02.2008 and thereafter applied a development cut of 20% while assessing the market value @ ₹ 17,20,000/- per acre.

3.8 This Court has heard the learned counsels for the parties at length and with their able assistance, perused the judgment passed by the Reference Court and also the lower Court record which had been

requisitioned. The landowners have also filed the written arguments.

**4. ARGUMENTS OF THE LEARNED COUNSEL
REPRESENTING THE PARTIES**

4.1 The learned senior counsel appearing for the landowners contend that Ex.P1 is a sale deed produced by the landowners which prove that as on 06.04.2007, the per acre rate of the land was ₹20,00,000/-. He submitted that due to the industrialization in the area, the increase in the market value price was steep and that being so, the Reference Court, after hiking the price by applying an increase of at least 50%, should have assessed the market value accordingly. He further submitted that as on 09.06.2006, the Court has assessed the market value of the land in village Baliyana @ ₹17,00,000/- per acre which as per Ex.P1 on 06.04.2007 increased to ₹20,00,000/- per acre within a period of ten months, reflecting an increase @ 17.65% per annum. He submitted that the Corporation sold the undeveloped land measuring 699.53 acres @ ₹75,00,000/- per acre on 13.08.2009 which represents 275% increase during the period of 27 months from 06.04.2007. He further submitted that as per the sale exemplar Ex.P3 dated 06.10.2009, 4 kanals land has been sold @ ₹52,00,000/- per acre which represents an increase of 110% from 13.02.2008 for a period of 20 months. The learned counsel further submitted that the Corporation itself vide a conveyance deed dated 01.07.2010 (Ex.P4) sold the plot measuring 4.86 acres @ ₹1,42,59,300/- per acre which represents 173% increase for a period of 9 months from 06.10.2009. He further contended that as per the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in *Mehrawal Khewaji Trust*

(Registered) Faridkot and Others v. State of Punjab and Others (2012) 5

SCC 432, the sale transaction representing the highest value (price consideration) should be preferred while assessing the market value.

4.2 Per contra, the learned counsel representing the Corporation contends that the Reference Court has erred in ignoring the sale exemplars produced by the Corporation as well as M/s Maruti Suzuki Limited. He submitted that the Reference Court has erred in refusing to consider the aforesaid sale exemplars on the ground that these sale exemplars show the average per acre price lower than what was assessed by the LAC. He submits that the aforesaid conclusion of the Reference Court is clearly erroneous. He relies upon the judgment passed in *Lal Chand v. Union of India and Another (2009)5 SCC 769*. He further submits that a perusal of the sale deeds produced by the Corporation clearly prove that the LAC has correctly assessed the amount and therefore, the Reference Court has erred in increasing the same to ₹17,20,000/- per acre.

4.3 The learned senior counsel appearing for M/s Maruti Suzuki Limited has reiterated the arguments of the learned counsel representing the Corporation.

5. ANALYSIS OF THE ARGUMENTS OF THE LEARNED COUNSEL

5.1 Before this Court proceeds to analyse the arguments of the learned counsel for the parties, it would be apt to examine the documentary evidence produced by the respective parties. The Reference Court has compiled the information with regard to the sale exemplars produced by the owners in a tabulated form, which is extracted as under:-

Sr. No.	Ex.	Vasika No.	Date	Land Area	Total Sale Consideration	Rate Per acre	Revenue Estate/ Village
1.	P1	33	6.4.2007	16 Kanal	40,00,000/-	20,00,000/-	Baliyana
2.	P2	682	26.6.2006	16 Kanal	50,00,000/-	25,00,000/-	Bohar
3.	P3	217	6.10.2009	4 Kanal	26,00,000/-	52,00,000/-	Baliyana
4.	P4	710	1.7.2010	19662 Sq. Meter	5,70,37,200/-	1,42,59,300/-	Baliyana
5.	P7	5626	27.9.2006	7 Kanal 9 Marla	32,12,813/-	34,50,000/-	Bohar
6.	P8	3088	3.7.2006	8 Kanal 14 Marla	38,06,250/-	35,00,000/-	Bohar
7.	P9	238	2.4.2006	3 Kanal 8 Marla	13,60,000/-	6,80,000/-	Bohar
8.	P10	5095	7.9.2006	31 Kanal 14 Marla	1,64,44,375/-	41,50,000/-	Bohar
9.	P11	14133	13.3.2006	5 Kanal	20,00,000/-	32,00,000/-	Bohar
10.	P12	3089	3.7.2006	1 Kanal 7.5 Marla	6,01,563/-	35,64,817/-	Bohar
11.	P13	3090	3.7.2006	4 Kanal	17,50,000/-	35,00,000/-	Bohar

5.2 On the other hand, the Corporation and M/s Maruti Suzuki Limited have produced the following sale exemplars, which is extracted as under:

S.No.	Ex. No.	Dated	Area	Amount	Village	Rate Per Acre
1.	R/2	23.04.2007	29 K	58,00,000/-	Baliyana	16,00,000/-
2.	R/3	24.05.2007	7K-6M	9,75,000/-	Baliyana	10,00,000/-
3.	R/4	02.08.2007	6K-8M	10,00,000/-	Baliyana	12,50,000/-
4.	R/2/2	24.08.2007	6K-8M	8,62,500/-	Baliyana	10,00,000/-
5.	R/2/3	15.05.2007	8K	15,50,000/-	Baliyana	15,50,000/-
6.	R/2/4	15.05.2007	2K-5M	2,90,000/-	Baliyana	10,31,111/-
7.	R/2/5	15.05.2007	3K-18M	4,88,000/-	Baliyana	10,01,025/-
8.	R/2/6	11.04.2008	5K-12M	7,70,000/-	Baliyana	11,00,000/-
9.	R/2/7	31.12.2007	5K	6,25,000/-	Baliyana	10,00,000/-
10.	R/2/8	15.05.2007	6K-7M	9,52,000/-	Baliyana	11,99,370/-
11.	R/2/9	31.12.2007	5K	6,25,000/-	Baliyana	10,00,000/-

5.3 On a careful perusal of the compiled tabulated information, it is

apparent that with respect to the land situated in village Baliyana, the landowners have produced three sale deeds. The sale deed (Ex.P3 and P4) are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. In the present case, the crucial date for assessing the market value of the acquired land is 13.02.2008. The remaining sale deeds are with respect to the land located in different villages. Thus, the only sale deed which is with respect to sale of the land located in the village before the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act is Ex.P1. On a careful perusal of the record, it becomes clear that 16 kanals land which was 320/1366th share of the total land measuring 68 kanals 6 marlas had been sold for a sum of ₹40,00,000/-. There are certain peculiar facts which create doubt about the genuineness of the transaction for the purpose of reliance to assess the market value of the concerned land. First of all, no stamp duty has been paid as the alleged purchaser is exempted from paying the stamp duty as per the policy of the State. The Haryana State has taken a policy decision to exempt the oustees of the compulsory acquisition of the land from the payment of the stamp duty while purchasing the land in the State. The alleged purchaser is one of the oustee. He is alleged to have purchased 16 kanals of agricultural land which is an undivided share, in a joint bigger parcel of the land. No doubt, the payment has been made through the various bank transactions and it has been recited in the sale deed that the actual physical possession of the land has been delivered to the purchaser at the time of execution of the sale deed. Yet, the land, possession whereof was delivered to the purchaser, has neither been identified through killa/khasra number nor through any other mode.

possession thereof after partition of joint land. However, if there is a recital with respect to delivery of actual physical possession of the purchased land, then it has to be with reference to the killa/khasra number or any other mode of identification to identify the land specifically from the revenue records. It is not the case of the landowners that the purchaser was delivered possession of the entire joint land although he purchased only a small portion in the joint land. Hence, the judgment in *Mehrawal Khewaji Trust's case (supra)* has no application.

5.4 There is yet another aspect which has come to the notice of the Court. The sale deed is scribed by Subhash Chander Sangwan, a professional scribe. The sale deeds Ex.R2, R2/2, R2/4, R2/5, R2/7, R2/8 and R2/9 are also scribed by the same scribe. In these sale deeds also, similarly undivided shares, out of joint land, have been shown to have purchased but while referring to the delivery of actual physical possession, killa/khasra numbers have not been disclosed for identifying the parcel of land possessed whereof such actual physical possession has been delivered. Once we compare the sale deeds Ex. R3, R4, R2/3 and R2/6, it is evident that even in the case of sale of an undivided part in the joint land, the delivery of possession has been recited while referring to a specific killa number.

5.5 Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, there is a lurking doubt about the genuineness of the sale transaction Ex.P1 for the purpose of placing reliance to assess the market value of the acquired land. It is significant to note here that the Corporation had initiated the acquisition proceedings of more than 700 acres of land in village Baliyana vide a

sale deeds with respect to sale transactions after 09.06.2006 which prove that the prices of the unacquired land, remaining after first notification, did not increase exorbitantly as it sought to be projected by the learned counsel representing for the appellants. The landowners have not produced any evidence to prove that the aforesaid sale deeds produced by the Corporation do not reflect the correct price. The Corporation is not a party to the sale deeds which have been produced in evidence.

5.6 Now the stage is set for analyzing the arguments of the learned counsel representing the appellants. It may be noted here that the learned counsel treats the base market value at ₹17,00,000/- on 09.06.2007 which is infact the assessment made by the Reference Court with respect to the acquisition initiated on 09.06.2006 vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. This is only an assessment made by the Reference Court on preponderance of the probabilities. Thereafter, the learned counsel representing the landowners has tried to project as if the price increased from ₹17,00,000/- to ₹20,00,000/- per acre within a period of ten months so as to reflect the increase of 17.65% per annum by referring to the sale exemplar Ex.P1. In the considered view of this Court, this is not the accurate way to assess the market value of the acquired land. This Court has already discussed its doubt about the genuineness of the sale exemplar Ex.P1 for assessing the market value of the acquired land. Thereafter, the learned counsel has tried to project that from 06.04.2007 the prices should increase between 55 to 100% over a period of ten months on the base market value price of ₹20,00,000/-. In the considered view of this Court, this is not the

particularly when sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period have been produced. Similarly, the learned counsel has erred in relying upon the sale of the land measuring 699.53 acres by the Corporation to M/s Maruti Suzuki Limited @ ₹75,00,000/- per acre. As per Section 23 and 24 of the 1894 Act, the sale deed post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act cannot be taken into consideration. The reliance in this regard can be placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maya Devi (Dead) through Legal Representative and Others v. State of Haryana and Others (2018) 2 SCC 474***. The relevant discussion is in para 5, which is extracted as under:-

“5. So far as the first contention is concerned, the sale deed relied upon by the appellants/claimants dated 27.12.1988 is post notification. Sub-section (1) of Section 23 of the Act provides that the compensation to be awarded shall be determined by the reference court, based upon the market value of the acquired land at the date of the publication of the notification under Section 4(1). In Kolkata Metropolitan Development Authority v. Gobinda Chandra Makal and Anr. (2011) 9 SCC 207, it was held that the relevant date for determining the compensation is the date of publication of the notification under Section 4(1) of the Act in the Gazette. In para (34), it was held as under:-

"34. One of the principles in regard to determination of the market value under Section 23(1) is that the rise in market value after the publication of the notification

under Section 4(1) of the Act should not be taken into account for the purpose of determination of market value. If the deeming definition of “publication of the notification” in the amended Section 4(1) is imported as the meaning of the said words in the first clause of Section 23(1), it will lead to anomalous results. The owners of the lands which are the subject-matter of the notification and neighbouring lands will come to know about the proposed acquisition, on the date of publication in the Gazette or in the newspapers. If the giving of public notice of the substance of the notification is delayed by two or three months, there may be several sale transactions in regard to nearby lands in that period, showing a spurt or hike in value in view of the development contemplated on account of the acquisition itself.”

Applying the ratio of the above decision, we are of the view that the post notification instances cannot be taken into consideration for determining the compensation of the acquired land”.

5.7 The sale deeds Ex.P3 and P4, respectively, are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, hence, cannot be relied upon particularly when the sale instances of contemporaneous period are available. It would be noted here that even if the sale deed Ex.R2/3

15.05.2007 was @ ₹15,50,000/- per acre approximately. Through this sale transaction, the land measuring 1 acre was sold for ₹15,50,000/-. This was again an undivided share, however, possession of the land comprised in rectangle No. 56 killa No.25 was specifically delivered. Moreover, the careful perusal of the sale deed Ex.R2/6 dated 11.04.2008 suggests that the market value price of the acquired land has not increased exponentially even after the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 13.02.2008. This sale deed shows that the land in the village was sold @ ₹11,00,000/- per acre.

5.8 It is well settled that the sale deeds produced by the State or the beneficiary of the acquisition, reflecting the price lesser than what was assessed by the LAC cannot be ignored. Section 25 of the 1894 Act only debars the Reference Court from assessing the market value at a rate lesser than what was assessed by the LAC. However, it nowhere debars the Reference Court from taking into consideration the sale deeds produced by any of the parties which reflect the price lower than what was assessed by the LAC. In the considered view of this Court, the sale exemplars produced by the parties are the best piece of evidence. The landowners have also relied upon the award No.3 and 4 passed by the LAC. The award No.3 is with respect to the acquisition of the different parcels of land. The landowners have also relied upon the award No.4 dated 13.07.2009 with respect to the acquisition of the land in village Bohar which is a different village. In this case, with respect to acquisition of land vide a notification dated 13.02.2008, the LAC assessed the market value @ ₹20,00,000/- per

land of village Bohar through award No.4 is analogous with the acquired land in village Baliyana.

5.9 Undoubtedly, while assessing the market value of the acquired land, the Courts have been adopting various methods to assess the correct market value. The best method to assess the market value of the acquired land is to compare it to the sale exemplar of contemporaneous period of the acquired land. In the absence thereof, the Court can rely upon the sale exemplars of the adjoining or nearby land. The assessment made by the Court with respect to a different parcels of land can be relied upon only if sufficient material is produced before the Court to prove that the assessment made by the Court with respect to the different parcels of land in a previous acquisition was analogous to the land acquired vide a subsequent notification and there is no direct evidence like the sale exemplars of the same period. No doubt, in the absence of the sufficient material, the courts assume an increase of price of the immovable property by hiking the same on the fixed percentage basis. However, such method can be adopted only if the comparable sale deeds of the same village and the same period are not available. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Lal Chand's case (supra)*.

5.10 The next argument of the learned counsel representing the landowners is with regard to the application of 20% development cut. In the present case, once there is a doubt about the genuineness of the sale deed Ex.P1 for the purpose of reliance to assess the market value, the aforesaid argument loses its sheen. However, in any case, through Ex.P1, only the

acquisition of the land, in the present case, is 713 acres 2 kanals and 5 marlas. The beneficiary agency is required to develop the area. In such circumstances, the development cut applied by the Reference Court cannot be said to be wrong.

5.11 It is pertinent to note that the Corporation has not filed any cross appeals. Hence, this court does not find any reason to modify or enhance the market value of the acquired land from the assessment of the Reference Court.

6. **CONCLUSION:**

6.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the conclusion is inescapable. There is no merit in the appeals. Hence, all the appeals are dismissed.

6.2 The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

October 27, 2021
“DK”

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

1.	RFA-31-2017	HARPAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-32-2017	JAIPAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
3.	RFA-33-2017	RAGHBIR SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
4.	RFA-34-2017	TARA CHAND (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-35-2017	BHIM SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
6.	RFA-36-2017	KHERI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

7.	RFA-37-2017	RAJBIR SINGH @ RAJ SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-38-2017	HARI SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-39-2017	KHAZANI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
10.	RFA-40-2017	SMT. SAVITA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
11.	RFA-41-2017	OM NARAIN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-42-2017	HOSHIYARA (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
13.	RFA-3986-2016	CHATTER SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
14.	RFA-3987-2016	PARVAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
15.	RFA-3988-2016	RAMPHAL DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
16.	RFA-3989-2016	PARVAT SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
17.	RFA-3990-2016	BALBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-3991-2016	RAVINDER AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
19.	RFA-3992-2016	BALBIR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-4050-2016	SUBE SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-4051-2016	DEVENDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
22.	RFA-4054-2016	RAM SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-4055-2016	RAMKANWAR DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
24.	RFA-4056-2016	SUBE SINGH AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
25.	RFA-4057-2016	JAIPAL AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-4058-2016	SMT. SUSHILA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-4059-2016	SOBHA AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-4060-2016	AZAD SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
29.	RFA-4061-2016	JAGBIR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
30.	RFA-4142-2016	PHOOLPATI (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

31.	RFA-4143-2016	MEER SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
32.	RFA-4144-2016	RAJENDER SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
33.	RFA-4145-2016	ASHOK KUMAR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
34.	RFA-4146-2016	MEER SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
35.	RFA-4147-2016	PARTAP SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
36.	RFA-4148-2016	NARENDER AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
37.	RFA-4181-2016	UMED SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
38.	RFA-4182-2016	OM PARKASH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
39.	FA-4183-2016	PAWAN KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
40.	RFA-4184-2016	KRISHAN KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
41.	RFA-4185-2016	PAWAN KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
42.	RFA-4186-2016	JAGDISH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
43.	RFA-4187-2016	KRISHAN KUMAR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
44.	RFA-4188-2016	BHALLE RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
45.	RFA-4189-2016	PAYARI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
46.	RFA-4190-2016	MEENA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
47.	RFA-4197-2016	PAWAN KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
48.	RFA-4419-2016	MEER SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
49.	RFA-4420-2016	SMT. SANTOSH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
50.	RFA-4421-2016	LEHNA SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
51.	RFA-4422-2016	SMT. SANTOSH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
52.	RFA-4423-2016	SMT. SANTOSH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
53.	RFA-4424-2016	SMT. SANTOSH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
54.	RFA-4482-2016	SHARMILA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
55.	RFA-4483-2016	PRITAM KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

56.	RFA-4522-2016	DALEL SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
57.	RFA-4523-2016	DALEL SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
58.	RFA-4524-2016	DALEL SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
59.	RFA-4525-2016	DHAN RAJ (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
60.	RFA-4526-2016	DHAN RAJ (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
61.	RFA-4527-2016	DHAN RAJ (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
62.	RFA-4528-2016	MAHA SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
63.	RFA-4529-2016	HUKAM SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
64.	RFA-4530-2016	DHAN RAJ (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
65.	RFA-4531-2016	MAHA SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
66.	RFA-4532-2016	MAHA SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
67.	RFA-4533-2016	SHYAM SUNDER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
68.	RFA-4534-2016	KAPOOR SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
69.	RFA-4535-2016	DHAN RAJ (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
70.	RFA-4536-2016	MAHA SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
71.	RFA-4537-2016	JAGDISH CHANDER AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
72.	RFA-4538-2016	DHARAMBIR @ DHARAMPAL (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
73.	RFA-4539-2016	DHARAMBIR @ DHARAMPAL (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
74.	RFA-4540-2016	DHARAMBIR ALIAS DHARMPAL (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
75.	RFA-4541-2016	AZAD SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
76.	RFA-4542-2016	DHARAMPAL AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
77.	RFA-4543-2016	CHAND ROOP AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
78.	RFA-4544-2016	SISH PAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND

		OTHERS
79.	RFA-4545-2016	JAGDISH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
80.	RFA-4546-2016	OMPATI AND (DECEASED) THROUGH HER LR OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
81.	RFA-4547-2016	PREET SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
82.	RFA-4548-2016	KRISHAN (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
83.	RFA-4549-2016	SAJJAN SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
84.	RFA-4550-2016	SMT. MALHO AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
85.	RFA-4551-2016	SAVITRI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
86.	RFA-4552-2016	HARPAL SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
87.	RFA-4553-2016	RAM KANWAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
88.	RFA-4554-2016	AZAD SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
89.	RFA-4555-2016	TEK RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
90.	RFA-4556-2016	DHARAMBIR @ DHARAMPAL (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
91.	RFA-4557-2016	AZAD SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
92.	RFA-4825-2016	MARUTI SUZUKI INDIA LTD V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
93.	RFA-4835-2016	SMT. RATNI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
94.	RFA-4836-2016	SANJEET AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
95.	RFA-4837-2016	SMT. RAMRATI (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
96.	RFA-4838-2016	BHIM SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
97.	RFA-4839-2016	VEER BHAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
98.	RFA-4840-2016	RAJ KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
99.	RFA-4841-2016	HAWA SINGH THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA

		AND OTHERS
100.	RFA-4842-2016	HAWA SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
101.	RFA-4843-2016	ISHWAR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
102.	RFA-4844-2016	OMPATI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
103.	RFA-4845-2016	UMED SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
104.	RFA-4846-2016	JAIPAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
105.	RFA-4851-2016	JAI CHAND V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
106.	RFA-4847-2016	SHANTI (DECEASED) THROUGH LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
107.	RFA-4852-2016	TARA CHAND (DECEASED) THROUGH LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
108.	RFA-10-2017	BALBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
109.	RFA-11-2017	MAHA SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
110.	RFA-12-2017	SMT. BRAHMO AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
111.	RFA-13-2017	VEDPAL (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
112.	RFA-14-2017	VEDPAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
113.	RFA-15-2017	RANDHIR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
114.	RFA-17-2017	KHERI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
115.	RFA-18-2017	CHANDER (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
116.	RFA-19-2017	DHARAMBIR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
117.	RFA-20-2017	DALIP (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
118.	RFA-21-2017	PURAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
119.	RFA-22-2017	KEHRI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
120.	RFA-23-2017	ISHWAR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
121.	RFA-28-2017	TARA CHAND (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
122.	RFA-29-2017	JAGBIR SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
123.	RFA-76-2017	SMT. SANTOSH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA

		AND ANOTHER
124.	RFA-120-2017	NAFE SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
125.	RFA-121-2017	MAHABIR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
126.	RFA-122-2017	RAMPHAL AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
127.	RFA-123-2017	RAM CHANDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
128.	RFA-124-2017	RAGBIR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
129.	RFA-170-2017	NAFE SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
130.	RFA-213-2017	NARAIN DUTT AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
131.	RFA-476-2017	BALMAT AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
132.	RFA-477-2017	SHAMSHER SINGH AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
133.	RFA-2470-2017	PARAS RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
134.	RFA-3691-2017	KARTAR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
135.	RFA-126-2018	DHARAM SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
136.	RFA-2015-2018	VIRENDER AND OTHERS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
137.	RFA-2685-2018	VIRENDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
138.	RFA-3594-2018	HAWA SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
139.	RFA-5049-2018	DHARMENDER AND OTHERS V/S LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND OTHERS
140.	RFA-5160-2018	SUNDER SINGH @ SURENDER SINGH V/S LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR CUM DRO ROHTAK AND OTHERS
141.	RFA-5163-2018	CHANDER SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
142.	RFA-1329-2019	SURENDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
143.	RFA-730-2017	JITENDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
144.	RFA-2176-2021	PREM SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS