

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RFA No.26 of 2022(O&M)

Date of order:13.09.2022

Reserved on:31.08.2022

HSI IDC

.Appellant

Versus

Mohakam Ram and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. B.R.Mahajan, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for HSI IDC.

Mr. Amit Jain, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Dhruv Mittal, Advocate

Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Advocate,
Mr. B.K.Bagri, Advocate
Mr. Ashish Jhamb, Advocate
for Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
Mr. Ranvijay Singh, Advocate
Mr. Hitesh Malik, Advocate
Mr. Jivesh Malik, Advocate
for the landowners.

Ms. Vibha Tewari, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION:-

1.1 While praying for the modification of a common award passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the RC') on 10.10.2021, a batch of Regular First Appeals (details whereof are at the foot of the judgment) has been filed by the landowners as well as the beneficiary of the acquisition, namely, Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (HSI IDC).

1.2 The notifications issued under Section 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, are common. The Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as 'the LAC') has offered to pay Rs.16,00,000/- per acre along with statutory benefits as compensation for acquiring 584 acres of land located in the four different villages namely, Bawal, Chirhara, Banipur and Rudh in the sub division Bawal. The awards passed by the RC are different but identical market value of the acquired land has been assessed. The learned counsels representing the parties are ad-idem that all the appeals in this batch can, conveniently, be disposed of by a common judgment.

1.3 The relevant particulars of the acquisitions are as under:-

Sr.No.	Relevant Date	Particular
1.	08.06.2007	Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition was issued proposing to acquire the land spread over in four villages, namely, Bawal, Chirhara, Banipur and Rudh for developing Industrial Model Township, Phase-III, Bawal.
2.	27.02.2008	Final declaration under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, was published.
3.	AWARDS 25.09.2008, 29.09.2008	The LAC offered to pay Rs.16,00,000/- per acre uniformly to all the landowners with respect to acquisition of land measuirng 584 acres in all the four villages
4.	17.01.2015, 30.05.2015, 16.07.2015 and 28.072015	By different awards, the RC, in the first round assessed the market value of the acquired land @ Rs.22,00,000/- per acre
5.	15.11.2017	In HSIIDC vs. Ram Kanwar (RFA No.4236 of 2016, the High Court remitted the matter back to the RC, for deciding afresh.
6.	14.10.2021	The RC, in second round, has assessed the market Value @ Rs.32,26,914/- per acre.

1.4 The landowners have projected that keeping in view the

location and potentiality of the acquired land, the amount offered by the LAC is not corresponding to the market value of the acquired land at the relevant time. It has been submitted that since 1990, HSIIDC has established its Industrial Growth Centre at Bawal and about 18 commercial sectors have already been developed, wherein the Multi National Companies like YKK (Japan), Pasco Steel (Korea), Caparo Maruit (U.K.), General Motors (UK), Indo Nissin Food (Japan), Mushashi India Limited (Japan), sunaki (Japan), Kehin Fi (Japan), NTN (Japan), RST (Japan), L.S. Cable (South Korea), Mitsui (Japan), Spaceage (Dubai), Hema (Germany), IGL (Japan), Gutterman (Germany), UFI Filter (Italy), and BD (Norway) have opened their units. Even prior to 08.06.2007, many hotels Like Le Meridian, Haldiram, Hospital-Jaipur Golden, show room of Liberty foot wears, petrol pumps and other well known commercial houses have been operating in the area. The companies like Asahi India Glass Limited, Nerolac Paints, Exide Battery, REI Agri, Metso, Garud Cement, Atlas Tube, Asian Colour Coated, Rani NSK, Wheel India, Tecpro, Sona and Tal Bros etc. have opened their factories in the area. Around 9 acres of land of Pasupati Company which is situated adjacent to the acquired land was auctioned @ Rs.24 Crore in the year 2006, whereas, 3200 sq. meters of land was auctioned by HSIIDC for Rs.15, 40,00,000/- for opening a 3 Star Hotel, in the year 2006.

1.5 Per contra, the HSIIDC has taken a stand the the amount assessed by the LAC is fair, proper and reasonable and the location and potential of the acquired land has been fairly assessed while announcing the award.

1.6 The RC has culled out the following issues for adjudication:-

“1. What was the market value of the acquired land on

the date of notification No.32/03/07 dated 08.06.2007 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894?OPP
2. Relief.”

1.7 In fact, the RC, in the first round, decided all these cases by 4 different judgments.

2. **ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE**

(I) IN THE CASES ARISING FROM ACQUISITION OF LAND IN VILLAGE BAWAL

2.1 The landowners examined the following witnesses in the oral evidence:-

PW1	Mani Ram
PW2	Sumer Singh
PW3	Om Parkash, Registration Clerk, Office of Sub-Registrar, Bawal
PW4	S.S.Lamba, Mnager, HSIIDC, IMT Bawal
PW5	Hukam Singh
PW6	Mussadi Lal
PW7	Mahabir Singh, Civil Draftsman, District Court, Rewari
PW8	Suresh Chand (wrongly mentioned as PW7)
PW8	Satyapal, B.Tech, Engineer

2.2 The landowners in the documentary evidence, produced the following documents (apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is provided in para 5.7 of the judgment):-

Ex.PW4/A	Memo No.186-87 dated 27.04.2006 allotting budged hotel site at Growth Centra, Bawal to M/s Jhankar Consultancy Pvt. Ltd.
Ex.PW4/B	Sketch of the plot allotted to M/s Jhankar Consultancy Pvt. Ltd.
Ex.PW5/1	Local Government Department notification dated 30.11.1995.
Ex.PW5/2	Jamabandi for the eyar 2004-05 related to Bawal.
Ex.PW6/B	Site plan of the property of Musaddi Lal etc. situated at

	Bawal.
Ex.PW7/A	Site plan of the acquired land
Ex.P8/1	Site plan prepared by Expert Satyapal
Ex.P8/2	Report regarding the property of Naveen prepared by the expert Satyapal
Ex.P8/3	Copy of renewal of licence of Satyapal Expert dated 28.01.2004
Ex.P-11	Copy of the award No.5/R dated 25.09.2008.

2.3 On the other hand, the HSIIDC examined the following witnesses in the oral evidence:-

RW1	Rajeev Kumar, Computer Operator-cum-Clerk, LAC-cum-SDO(Civil)
RW2	Rewari Ashok Kumar, HSIIDC, IMT, Bawal
RW3	Jitenedr Kumar, Clerk, SDM Office, Bawal

2.4 In documentary evidence, the HSIIDC produced the following documents (apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is provided in para 5.7 of the judgment:-

Ex.RA	Memo No.1E/LA/3677A2K6M/RWR/Part-IV/91-A dated 02.01.2015 withdrawing the land for Manesar and Bawal Division from acquisition in public interest.
Ex.R-B	List of sale deeds
Ex.RW2/B	Copy of the notification dated 07.12.2007 related to the policy for rehabilitation and resettlement of land owners-Land Acquisition Oustees.
Ex.RW2/C	Details of annuity as per R&R policy at IMT Bawal
Ex.RW2/D	Public Notice inviting applications from oustees/erstwhile land owners for allotment of residential plots under resettlement and rehabilitation policy dated 07.12.2007.
Ex.RW2/E	Public Notice
Ex.RW2/F	List of development works undertaken by HSIIDC in the villages whose land is acquired.
Ex.RY	Copy of the LAC award dated 10.12.2014 regarding the structures on the acquired land.

Ex.RZ	Letter No.HSIIDC/IMT/14/619 dated 14.05.2014 regarding transfer of the amount of Rs.34,34,100/- by the HSIIDC into the account of SDO(Civil)-cum-LAC, Rewari.
-------	---

2.5 In the rebuttal evidence, the landowners produced the following documentary evidence:-

Ex.P11	Certified copy of the award dated 17.01.2015 passed in LA case No.161 of 2011 titled as Babu Lal and others vs. State of Haryana and others
Ex.P12	Copy of the award dated 30.05.2015 passed in LA case No.1 of 211 titled as Shish Ram and others vs. State of Haryana and others
Ex.P13	Copy of the judgment dated 14.09.2010 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in RFA No.3541 of 2006 (O&M) titled as Nandram and others vs. State of Haryana and others.
Ex.P14	Copy of the judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the Civil Appeal No.9553 of 2011 titled as HSIIDC vs. Nand Ram and others.

2.6 After remand of the case by the High Court vide order dated 15.11.2017, the landowners examined PW9-Om Parkash Yadav, Draftsman, PW10-P.K.Dabas, Architect, PW11-Naveen Kumar. The following documents were further produced by the landowners:-

Ex.PW9/B	Site plan of the property of Naveen Kumar situated at Bawal.
Ex.PW10/B	Report of valuation of immovable property
Ex.PW10/C	Cash memo by Sarja Civicon consultancy
Ex.PW11/1 to Ex.PW11/11	Electricity bills in the name of Naveen Kumar
Ex.PW11/12	Aks-sajra of village Bawal
Ex.PW11/13	Jamabandi of village Bawal for the year 2011-12
Ex.PW11/14	Jamabandi of village Bawal for the eyar 2004-05
Ex.PW11/15	Mutation No.9809 sanctioned in favour of Naveen etc. on the demise of Rattan Singh
Ex.PW11/16 to Ex.PW11/27	Photographs of the superstructure and trees over the acquired land belonging to Naveen Kumar etc.

Ex.PW11/28	Copy of the notice under Section 9 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.
Ex.PW11/29	Copy of the objections filed by Naveen Kumar before the Lanc Acquisition Collector-cum-SDO, Rewari
Ex.PW11/30	Letter No.12958 dated 06.10.2009 from the Executive Engineer, PWD (B&R) Rewari to Sh. Naveen Kumar
Ex.PW11/31	Award dated 10.12.2014 respecting the structures on the acquired land
Ex.PW11/32	Valuation summary of the structures existing on the acquired land of Bawal.
Ex.PW11/33 and Ex.PW11/34	Valuation of shops/house/building/structure

2.7 After the remand of the cases by the High Court, the HSIIDC neither examined any witness nor tendered any document.

(II) In the cases of **Shish Ram and others (since deceased) through LRS and others vs. State of Haryana and others, Jai Narain and others vs. State of Haryana and others, Abey Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others, Rajender Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others**, the following evidence was produced.

2.8 The landowners examined the following witnesses in the oral evidence:-

PW1	Basti Ram
PW2	Mahavir Yadav, Draftsman
PW3	Abhey Singh, Legal Assistant HSIIDC, IMT Bawal
PW4	Ramnath
PW5	Kuldeep, Patwari, Halqa Sulkha, Tehsil Bawal

2.9 The landowners also produced the following documentary evidence apart from the sale deeds, a table of which is compiled in para No.5.7 of the judgment:-

Ex.PW2/A	Site plan of the acquired land
Ex.PW3/A	Memo No.186-87 dated 27.04.2006 regarding

	allotment of budged hotel site at Growth Centre, Bawal, through Jhankar Consultancy Pvt. Ltd.
Ex.PW4/1	Certified copy of the sale deed no.43 dated 13.04.2006
Ex.PW5/A	Aks-sajra related to village-Rudh
Ex.PW5/B	Mutation NO.422
Ex.PW5/C	Jamabandi for the eyar 2008-09 related to village-Bawal.
Ex.P7	Certified copy of the award dated 17.01.2015 passed in LA case No.161 of 2011 titled as Babu Lal and others vs. State of Haryana and others.

2.10 On the other hand, the HSIIDC once again examined RW1-Ashok Kumar, HSIIDC, IMT Bawal, and also examined RW2-Jitender Kumar, Clerk.

2.11 In the documentary evidence, the following documents were produced by the HSIIDC, apart from the sale deeds a tabulated compilation of which is provided in Para No.5.7 of the judgment:-

Ex.RA	Statement of the Land Acquisition Collector
Ex. RB	State No.19 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.
Ex.RC	Copy of award No.3/R dated 29.08.2008 related to village Rudh
Ex.RD	Memo No.1E/LA/3677A2K6M/RWR/Part-IV/91-A dated 02.01.2015 withdrawing the land for Manesar and Bawal Division from acquisition in public interest.
Ex.RE	List of sale deeds
Ex.RW1/B	Copy of the notification dated 07.12.2007 related to the policy for rehabilitation and resettlement of land owners-Land Acquisition Oustees.
Ex.RW1/C	Details of annuity as per R&R policy at IMT Bawal
Ex.RW1/D	Public notice inviting applications from oustees/erstwhile land owners for allotment of residential plots under resettlement and rehabilitation policy dated 07.12.2007
Ex.RW1/E	Public notice
Ex.RW1/F	Conditions for allotment of residential plot under R&R policy dated 07.12.2007.
Ex.RW1/G	Memo dated 19.04.2012 regarding resumption of the budged hotel site allotted to M/s Jhankar Consultants

	Pvt. Ltd.
Ex.RW1/	Proceedings of the meeting regarding fixation of Collector rates dated 30.05.2008
Ex.RW1/J	HSIIDC IMT Bawal, layout plan of phase I to IV.

(III) In the case of Jai Narain and others vs. State of Haryana and others.

2.12 In oral evidence, PW1-Chiranji Lal appeared on behalf of the landowners.

2.13 The landowners produced the following documents in documentary evidence (apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is provided in Para 5.7 of the judgment):-

Exp22	Copy of the judgment dated 14.09.2010 passed by Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in RFA Nop.3541 of 2006 (O&M) titled as Nandram and others vs. State of Haryana and others
Ex.P23	Copy of the judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the Civil Appeal No.9553 of 2011 titled as HSIIDC vs. Nand Ram and others
Ex.P24	Certified copy of the award dated 30.05.2015 passed in LA case No.1 of 2011 titled as Shish Ram and others vs. State of Haryana and others.

2.14 On the other hand, the HSIIDC examined RW1-Ashok Kumar, HISIDC, IMT Bawal, and RW2-Jitender Kumar, Clerk.

2.15 The following documents were also produced by the HSIIDC, apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is provided in Para No.5.7 of the judgment:-

Ex.RW1/B	Copy of the notification dated 07.12.2007 related to the policy for rehabilitation and resettlement of land owners-Land Acquisition Oustees
Ex.RW1/C	Details of annuity as per R&R Policy at IMT Bawal.
Ex.RW1/D	Public notice inviting applications from oustees/erstwhile land owners for allotment of residential plots under resettlement and rehabilitation

	policy dated 07.12.2007
Ex.RW1/E	Public Notice
Ex.RW1/F	Terms and conditions for eligibility of allotment of residential plots
Ex.RW1/G	Memo dated 19.04.2012 regarding resumption of the budged hotel site allotted to M/s Jhankar Consultants Pvt. Ltd.
Ex.RW1/H	Proceedings of the meeting regarding fixation of Collector rates dated 30.05.2008
Ex.RW1/J	HSIIDC, IMT Bawal, layout plan of phase I to IV
Ex.RB	List of sale deeds
Ex.RC	Statement of Land Acquisition Collector
Ex.RD	Statement No.19 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894
Ex.RE	Copy of the award No.2/R related to village Chirhara.

(IV) **In the case of Rajender Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others.**

2.16 The landowners did not examine any witness and no documentary evidence was produced.

(V) **In the case of Abhey Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others.**

2.17 The landowners examined the following witnesses in the oral evidence:-

PW1	Ramesh
PW2	Raghubir Singh, Patwari, HSIIDC, IMT Bawal
PW3	Dharambir
PW4	Shri Sumit Mohan, Assistant Record keeper, District Courts, Rewari
PW5	Sh. Shiv Charan, Halqa Patwari

2.18 The landowners produced the following documents, apart from the sale deeds, a table of which is compiled in Para 5.7 of the judgment:-

Ex.P1	Copy of notification No.32/10/92-41B1 dated 03.09.1993
Ex.P2	Copy of notification No.32/13/05-4IBI dated

	13.03.2006
Ex.P3	Copy of notification No.32/3/2007-4IBI dated 27.02.2008
Ex.P4	Certified copy of the award ated 28.07.2015 passed by Sh. J.S. Kundu, the then learned ADJ, Rewari, in LA case No.221 of 2011 titled as Sardar Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others
Ex.P5	Aks-sajra related to village Banipur
Ex.P6	Mutation NO.1004
Ex.P7	Certified copy of the award dated 07.05.2018 passed in LA case No.221 of 2018 titled as Sardar Singh and others vs. State of Haryana and others.

2.19 In the second round, as many as 284 reference petitions were disposed of while assessing Rs.41,24,016/- per acre as market value of the acquired land along with all statutory benefits vide the award dated 07.05.2018. In **HSI IDC vs. Teshi and others (RFA No.3146 of 2019)**, (Date of decision 16.12.2019), the High Court, once again, set aside the award passed by the RC while directing re-decision. After the second remand, the landowners, once again, examined PW12-Sunil Kumar, HRC, PW13-Ravinder Singh, Registration Clerk, Sub-Registrar Offier, Bawal, PW14-Mahavir Yadav, Draftsman, District Courts, Rewari, in the oral evidence. A layout plan of the property was produced as Ex.PW14/1 in the documentary evidence.

2.20 On the other hand, the HSI IDC examined RW4-Madan Lal, Patwari, HSI IDC, IMT Bawal in the oral evidence, and produced layout plans Ex.RW6/A of HSI IDC, Bawal in respect of the acquired land in villages, Bawal, Banipur, Chirhara, Rudh, Asalwas, Suthani, Suthana, Jalalpur, Jaliawas, Bagthala, Deodhai and Karnawas in the documentary evidence.

3. **REASONS GIVEN BY THE REFERENCE COURT**

3.1 This court has carefully read the various awards passed by the RC. In substance, the RC has recorded the following reasons to award an amount of Rs.32,26,914/- per acre:-

- (1) In view of Section 25 of the 1894 Act, the sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC reflecting a price lower than the amount offered by the LAC in its award cannot be taken into consideration.
- (2) The sale deeds EX.P1 to Ex.P7 are with respect to significantly small parcels of land and therefore, held to be not comparable.
- (3) Sale deed no.1316 dated 19.09.2006 and sale deed no.1770 dated 29.10.2006, of land measuring 1 kanal each, have been found relevant to assess the market value of the acquired land.
- (4) Similarly, the court found that sale deeds no.43 dated 13.04.2006 with respect to 19 kanals and 8 marlas of land in village Bawal is the most relevant sale deed to assess the fair market price.
- (5) Thereafter, the RC held that the four sale deeds, namely, sale deeds no.1316 dated 19.09.2006, Sale deed No. 1770 dated 29.11.2006 , sale deed no. 43, dated 13.04.2006 and sale deed no.1065 dated 21.08.2008 relate to significantly large chunks of land and therefore, are worth relying upon for the purpose of assessment of the market value of the acquired land.

- (6) Subsequently, the RC held that if the average sale price of the aforesaid four sale deeds is calculated, it comes to Rs. 53,78,190/-. Thereafter, the court proceeded to apply deduction of 40% on account of cost of development of the acquired land and utilization of space for providing infrastructural facilities like roads, passages etc.
- (7) Finally, the RC arrived at a figure of Rs.32,26,914/- per acre with respect to the entire acquired land located in all the four villages. The claim with regard to the enhancement of compensation on account of structures was dismissed by the RC.

4. **ARGUMENTS MADE BY THE LEARNED COUNSELS REPRESENTING THE PARTIES:-**

4.1 This Bench has heard the learned counsels representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the voluminous record of the RC contained in as many as 3 large volumes. The synopsis filed by the learned counsels representing the respective parties have also been carefully examined by this Court.

4.2 The learned senior counsel representing the appellant submits that the first phase of the acquisition of land of village Bawal was proposed for the IMT in the year 1992, whereas the second phase for acquisition was proposed on 02.12.2004. He submits that in these appeals, the acquisition of the land for the IIIrd phase has come up for hearing. Hence, the entire area was already a developed area, therefore, it is not appropriate to assess the market value while considering the acquired land as agricultural in nature.

Consequently, the sale instances Ex. P1 to Ex.P7 and Ex.P10 in the

concerned record are relevant, the RC should have taken the average price of the various sale deeds produced by the landowners and thereafter, applied a deduction of 20% in order to arrive at the true market value of the acquired land. He further submits that the sale deed no.43 (Ex.P3), dated 13.04.2006, which is with respect to the land measuring 19 kanals and 8 marlas in the revenue estate of Bawal is not only relevant but is the most appropriate exemplar to determine the market value of the acquired land. While referring to the layout plan Ex.PW14/1, he submits that some part of the acquired land forms a part of the land comprised in Rect. No.46. Similarly, sale deed No.43 dated 13.04.2006, which is of a sufficiently large parcel of land, also forms a part of the land comprised in Rect. No.46. He further submits that the court has erred in applying a deduction of 40% on the figure arrived at by taking the average of the price reflected in sale deeds bearing no.1316, 1770, 43 and 1065. While concluding, he submits that at the most, 20% development cut could have been applied while assessing the market value of the acquired land.

4.3 Per contra, the learned Advocate General, Haryana, ably assisted by Sh. Pritam Singh Saini, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, submits that the RC, while wrongly interpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act, has ignored the various sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC. It is further contended that the sale deed no.43 dated 13.04.2006 pertains to a commercial area that is located across the Delhi-Jaipur Highway i.e. on the other side of the road. He, hence, submits that the aforesaid sale exemplar is not comparable because the first and second stage of the IMT was largely developed on the North-Western side of the highway, as is the location of the parcel of land sold through the sale deed No.43. It is further contended

that the sale exemplars Ex.P1 to Ex.P10 are with respect to tiny plots of land which, ordinarily, are not used for agricultural purposes. While highlighting, he submits that majority of the acquired land is proved to be agricultural, therefore, the entire land should not be assessed as commercial land.

5. **DISCUSSION BY THIS COURT**

5.1 Before analyzing the arguments of the learned counsels representing the parties, it is appropriate to notice that the first reason assigned by the RC is the result of a wrong interpretation of Section 25 of the 1894 Act, which reads as under:-

“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”.

5.2 It is evident that the provision only debars the Court from awarding compensation of an amount which is lesser than the amount awarded by the Collector(LAC). However, there is no prohibition or restriction to take into consideration/account the sale deeds produced by the parties reflecting a price lower than the price offered by the LAC. This issue is no longer res-integra in view of the judgment in **Lal Chand vs. Union of India and another (2009) 5 SCC 769.** The RC was correct in observing that the sale deed Ex.P1 to Ex.P7 are with respect to significantly small sized plots, therefore, they are not comparable to the acquired land. However, the RC has committed an error in placing reliance on sale deeds nos.1316, 1770 and 1065. It may be noted here that sale deed no.1316 and 1770 are only with respect to plots measuring 1 Kanal each, which

ordinarily consist of 605 sq. yds. of land. An acre of land ordinarily consist of 4840 sq. yards area. Therefore, these plots are not with respect to the parcels of agricultural land. From a bare look at the layout plan Ex.PW14/1, it is evident that the sale deeds bearing no.1316, 1770 and 2146 are with respect to parcels of land located on Bawal-Rewari road situated near the residential and commercial area. Hence, the reliance placed by the RC on these sale instances to assess the market value of the agricultural land is not considered appropriate.

5.3 The RC has also committed an error in calculating the average of sale deeds bearing no.1316, 1770, 43 and 1065. In fact, sale deed no.1065 is also located in a residential area as per Ex.P14/1. Hence, the same is not with respect to a comparable parcel of land.

5.4 While assessing the market value of the acquired land under the 1894 Act, the Court is guided by the provisions of Section 23 and 24 of the 1894 Act, which are extracted as under:-

23. Matters to be considered on 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 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 serving 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, 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.

[(1A) 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 on 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.]

5.5 It may be noted here that as per Clause 'First' of Section 23 (1), the market value of the acquired land at the date of publication of notification under Section 4 (1) of the 1894 Act is required to be assessed. The court is also expected to analyze the evidence produced by the parties in a proper perspective while adopting a pragmatic approach. The primary duty of the Court is to assess the market value on which a willing seller is able to find a willing buyer to purchase the land. Thus, the assessment made by the court must not only be realistic but it should reflect the actual market value of the acquired land on the date of publication of notification under Section 4(1) of the 1894 Act.

5.6 While arriving at such a finding, the court is required to look for comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period. The reliance placed on judicial precedents should normally be avoided unless there is no other evidence available on record. Before placing reliance on a particular sale instance or a group of sale instances, the court is required to thoroughly examine the sale deeds apart from analyzing the other evidence produced by the parties.

5.7 At this stage, it is considered appropriate to compile the information with regard to various sale exemplars produced by the respective parties in the various reference petitions. It is noted here that the

sale deeds are compiled and referred in the judgment by their sale deed number for the sake of clarity, convenience and to avoid confusion as the same sale deeds are marked with different exhibit numbers in the various petitions. The compilation is produced as under:-

Sr. No.	Sale deed No.	Date	Total area	Price consideration	Price per acre	Village
SALE DEEDS PRODUCED BY THE LANDOWNERS						
1.	2146	30.01.2007	10M	9,00,000	1,44,00,000	Bawal
2.	1316	19.09.2006	1K (20M)	18,25,000	1,46,00,000	Bawal
3.	43	13.04.2006	19K 8M (388M)	1,00,00,000	41,23,711	Bawal
4.	1770	29.11.2006	1K (20M)	19,00,000	1,52,00,000	Bawal
5.	2863	20.10.2011	4K 13M (93M)	23,25,000	40,00,000	Bawal
6.	363	13.06.2005	216 Sq. Yr.	2,16,000	48,40,000	Bawal
7.	661	26.08.2004	240 Sq. Yr.	4,80,000	96,80,000	Bawal
8.	1170	06.01.2005	138 Sq. Yr.	2,76,000	96,80,000	Bawal
9.	366	13.06.2005	100 Sq. Yr.	2,20,000	1,06,48,000	Bawal
10.	376	14.06.2005	450 Sq. Yr.	3,60,000	38,72,000	Bawal
11.	84	04.05.2005	342 Sq. Yr.	1,71,000	24,20,000	Chirhara
12.	1419	16.03.2005	100 Sq. Yr.	80,000	38,72,000	Bawal
13.	342	08.06.2005	220 Sq. Yr.	2,20,000	48,40,000	Bawal
14.	365	13.06.2005	260 Sq. Yr.	2,60,000	48,40,000	Bawal
15.	360	13.06.2005	133 Sq. Yr.	1,33,000	48,40,000	Bawal
16.	767	13.09.2004	67 Sq. Yr.	1,00,000	72,23,881	Bawal
17.	364	13.06.2005	600 Sq. Yr.	6,00,000	48,40,000	Bawal
18.	343	08.06.2005	247 Sq. Yr.	2,47,000	48,40,000	Bawal
19.	1169	06.01.2005	94 Sq. Yr.	57,000	29,34,894	Bawal
20.	847	22.09.2004	322 Sq. Yr.	1,90,000	28,55,901	Bawal
21.	48	26.04.2005	1M	2,80,000	4,48,00,000	Chirhara
22.	1389	04.03.2005	1M	1,00,000	1,60,00,000	Chirhara
23.	113	10.05.2005	3M	1,95,000	1,04,00,000	Bawal
24.	371	29.06.2004	53 Sq. Yr.	60,000	54,79,245	Bawal

25.	649	23.08.2004	7M	1,31,000	29,94,286	Bawal
26.	386	15.06.2005	175 Sq. Yr.	1,75,000	48,40,000	Bawal
27.	846	22.09.2004	67 Sq. Yr.	1,00,000	72,23,880	Bawal
28.	1272	09.12.2005	3M	83,000	44,26,667	Bawal
29.	1275	09.12.2005	2M	1,60,600	1,28,48,000	Bawal
30.	1276	09.12.2005	7M	2,07,000	47,31,428	Bawal
31.	1277	09.12.2005	14M	4,47,000	51,08,571	Bawal
32.	1278	09.12.2005	4M (133 Sq. Yr.)	2,92,000	1,06,26,165	Bawal
33.	1285	12.12.2005	1M	72,600	1,16,16,000	Bawal
34.	1286	12.12.2005	6M	1,32,000	35,20,000	Bawal
35.	1065	21.08.2006	1K 5M (25M)	15,02,000	96,12,800	Bawal
36.	1066	21.08.2006	3M	3,05,000	1,62,66,667	Bawal
37.	34	09.04.2007	4M	5,35,000	2,14,00,000	Bawal
38.	154	04.05.2007	7M	9,05,000	2,06,85,714	Bawal
SALE DEEDS PRODUCED BY THE STATE						
1.	775	13.07.2006	1K 7M (27M)	1,63,000	9,65,926	Bawal
2.	777	13.07.2006	5K 7M (107M)	6,70,000	10,01,869	Bawal
3.	801	17.07.2006	2K 5M (45M)	2,81,000	9,99,111	Bawal
4.	852	24.07.2006	3K 12M (72M)	4,50,000	10,00,000	Bawal
5.	853	24.07.2006	5K 10M (110M)	5,50,000	8,00,000	Bawal
6.	881	27.07.2006	4K (80M)	6,00,000	12,00,000	Bawal
7.	902	31.07.2006	4K (80M)	5,00,000	10,00,000	Bawal
8.	911	01.08.2006	1K 1M (21M)	1,32,000	10,05,714	Bawal
9.	919	02.08.2006	20K (400M)	28,12,500	11,25,000	Bawal
10.	931	03.08.2006	3K 4M (64M)	4,00,000	10,00,000	Bawal
11.	940	04.08.2006	11A 1K	1,40,00,000	12,50,000	Bawal

			12M (1792M)			
12.	1164	04.09.2006	6K 14M (134M)	9,50,000	11,34,328	Bawal
13.	1203	07.09.2006	4K (80M)	5,00,000	10,00,000	Bawal
14.	1398	27.09.2006	17K 6M (346M)	11,00,000	5,08,671	Bawal
15.	1399	27.09.2006	45K 4M (904M)	28,00,000	4,95,575	Bawal
16.	1445	06.10.2006	4K 6M (86M)	6,45,000	12,00,000	Bawal
17.	1491	11.10.2006	1K 16M (36M)	2,25,000	10,00,000	Bawal
18.	1501	12.10.2006	1A 5K 3M (263M)	20,00,000	12,16,730	Bawal
19.	1617	03.11.2006	2K (40M)	3,00,000	12,00,000	Bawal
20.	1646	09.11.2006	7K 10M (150M)	9,37,500	10,00,000	Bawal
21.	1691	17.11.2006	6K 16M (136M)	10,25,000	12,05,882	Bawal
22.	1715	21.11.2006	5K 17M (117M)	7,31,250	10,00,000	Bawal
23.	1739	24.11.2006	1K 16M (36M)	2,25,000	10,00,000	Bawal
24.	1742	24.11.2006	149 Sq. Yr.	50,000	16,24,161	Bawal
25.	1743	24.11.2006	85 Sq. Yr.	30,000	17,08,235	Bawal
26.	1813	05.12.2006	3K 10M (70M)	4,40,000	10,05,714	Bawal
27.	1885	15.12.2006	1A (160M)	8,00,000	8,00,000	Bawal
28.	1894	15.12.2006	5K 6M (106M)	6,65,000	10,03,774	Bawal
29.	1896	18.12.2006	3K (60M)	4,10,000	10,93,333	Bawal
30.	1912	20.12.2006	7K 18M (158M)	9,87,500	10,00,000	Bawal
31.	1932	21.12.2006	19M	1,25,000	10,52,632	Bawal
32.	1984	03.01.2007	1A 6M (166M)	10,37,500	10,00,000	Bawal

33.	2006	08.01.2007	4K 12M (92M)	5,75,000	10,00,000	Bawal
34.	2087	18.01.2007	2K 18M (58M)	4,00,000	11,03,448	Bawal
35.	2130	25.01.2007	13K 12M (272M)	8,00,000	4,70,588	Bawal
36.	2131	25.01.2007	13K 12M (272M)	8,00,000	4,70,588	Bawal
37.	2218	09.02.2007	3K 13M (73M)	4,70,000	10,30,137	Bawal
38.	2219	09.2.2007	1K 15M (35M)	2,25,000	10,28,571	Bawal
39.	2220	09.02.2007	1K 14M (34M)	2,20,000	10,35,294	Bawal
40.	2256	15.02.2007	3K 8M (68M)	4,25,000	10,00,000	Bawal
41.	2301	23.02.2007	1K 18M (38M)	2,85,000	12,00,000	Bawal
42.	2332	26.02.2007	3K 18M (78M)	4,87,500	10,00,000	Bawal
43.	2534	29.03.2007	2A (320M)	20,00,000	10,00,000	Bawal
44.	2535	29.03.2007	1K 8M (28M)	1,40,000	8,00,000	Kheri Dalu Singh, Teh.- Bawal
45.	19	05.04.2007	7K 1M (141M)	9,00,000	10,21,277	Bawal
46.	20	05.04.2007	4K 10M (90M)	6,75,000	12,00,000	Bawal
47.	52	11.04.2007	2K 15M (55M)	3,43,750	10,00,000	Bawal
48.	66	13.04.2007	1K 14M (34M)	2,60,000	12,23,529	Bawal
49.	115	27.04.2007	30K 7M (607M)	60,00,005	15,81,550	Bawal
50.	141	02.05.2007	2K (40M)	3,00,000	12,00,000	Bawal
51.	143	02.05.2007	1A 5K 6M	19,95,000	12,00,000	Bawal

			(266M)			
52.	240	16.05.2007	3K 12M (72M)	5,40,000	12,00,000	Bawal
53.	244	17.05.2007	5K 2M (102M)	7,65,000	12,00,000	Bawal
54.	310	23.5.2007	99 Sq. Yr.	98,214	48,01,573	Bawal
55.	316	24.05.2007	1K 18M (38M)	3,00,000	12,63,158	Bawal
56.	459	06.06.2007	2K 1M (41M)	3,07,500	12,00,000	Bawal
57.	643	22.06.2007	3K 16M (76M)	5,70,000	12,00,000	Bawal
58.	704	29.06.2007	1K 15M (35M)	2,62,500	12,00,000	Bawal
59.	725	02.07.2007	5K 16M (116M)	8,70,000	12,00,000	Bawal
60.	1985	03.01.2007	1K 13M (33M)	1,65,000	8,00,000	Banipur, Teh. Bawal
61.	984	09.08.2006	15K 3M (303M)	15,15,000	8,00,000	Banipur, Teh. Bawal
62.	861	25.7.2006	1K 3M (23M)	1,15,000	8,00,000	Chirhara, Teh. Bawal
63.	860	25.07.2006	2K (40M)	2,00,000	8,00,000	Chirhara, Teh. Bawal
64.	886	27.07.2006	12K 3M (243M)	15,18,750	10,00,000	Rudh, Teh. Bawal
65.	885	27.07.2006	8K 3M (163M)	10,18,750	10,00,000	Rudh, Teh. Bawal
66.	1183	06.09.2006	2K 12M (52M)	3,25,000	10,00,000	Rudh, Teh. Bawal
67.	1893	15.12.2006	2A 1K 10M (350M)	17,50,000	8,00,000	Rudh, Teh.

						Bawal
68.	857	24.07.2006	16K 4M (324M)	20,25,000	10,00,000	Rudh, Teh. Bawal
69.	789	14.07.2006	2K 11M (51M)	3,25,000	10,19,608	Rudh, Teh. Bawal
70.	751	11.7.2006	30K 14M (614M)	28,50,000	7,42,671	Rudh, Teh. Bawal
71.	750	11.7.2006	5K 19M (119M)	7,45,000	10,01,681	Rudh, Teh. Bawal

NOTE:- The sale deeds bearing number 1203 and 846 have inadvertently not been marked as exhibits. Therefore, the Court while exercising its power under Order XIII Rule 4 CPC, as amended for the States of Punjab and Haryana, marks them as HC1 and HC2, respectively.

5.8 On a perusal of the aforesaid tabulated information, it is evident that the landowners have produced the sale deed no.43, dated 13.04.2006 with respect to 19 kanals and 08 marlas of land. A perusal of this sale deed shows that commercial land out of the land comprised in Rect. No.40 and 46 has been purchased by a corporate entity. With reference to the units of the agricultural land, a rectangle denotes a compact rectangular block of 25 acres of land consisting of 5 acres x 5 acres of land. During the consolidation of holdings under the East Punjab Holding (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948, the entire land of the village is divided into rectangles and each rectangle is assigned a numeric value starting from the rectangle in the North-Eastern part of the village.

5.9 Vide sale deed No.43, the parcel of land is located on the North-

Western side of the Delhi-Jaipur Highway has been sold , whereas the acquired land is located on the South-Eastern side of the said Highway. It may be noted here that on perusal of Ex.P14/1, it is evident that the acquired land in Phase-I and Phase-II of the IMT, was mostly towards the North-Western side of the highway, whereas, some part was located on South-Eastern side of the highway. The NCT of Delhi is located on the North-Eastern side, whereas, Jaipur is located on the South-Western side. Apart from the aforesaid facts, there is another road which goes from Bawal Town to Rewari which cuts the acquired land into different parcels. Along side the Delhi-Jaipur Highway, most of the land has already been acquired during the acquisition of land for developing Phase-I and Phase-II of IMT. The land acquired in village Rudh vide this notification is descending the land already acquired for Phase-I & II of IMT. In fact, the residential area of village Rudh is towards the North-Western side of the National Highway, whereas, some part of the acquired land in village Rudh is located on the South-Eastern side of the Highway. After the land of revenue estate of village Rudh comes to an end, thereafter, the area of village Bawal starts. As already noticed, the sale deed number 43 dated 13.04.2006 not only pertains to a commercial area but is also located exactly on the Delhi-Jaipur Highway. A substantial portion of the acquired land is far away from the Delhi-Jaipur Highway. In fact, a significantly large area of the acquired land of revenue estate of Bawal is at a distance from the Delhi-Jaipur Highway. The acquired land of village Banipur as well as Chirhara is also located at a significant distance from the National Highway, but there are certain parcels of land that are located near the National Highway. When we travel towards Jaipur i.e. South-Western corner of the acquired land, around 20 acres of

acquired land of village Bawal abuts the Delhi-Jaipur highway. For assessing the market value of the land abutting the Delhi-Jaipur Highway upto the depth of two acres, the sale deed No.43 dated 13.04.2006 can be relied upon. It may be noted here that the parcel of land acquired vide sale deed no.43 is not only located on the Delhi-Jaipur highway but it is also located on a four legged intersection of another village which goes upto village Harchandpur from Bawal. As already noticed, most of the developed industrial area acquired for Phase-I and II of the IMT is located on the other side. Hence, it is considered appropriate to apply deduction on the price reflected in sale deed no.43. It has been noticed that there is a time gap of one year and two months between sale deed no.43 (13.04.2006) and 08.06.2007 i.e. the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Therefore, at the first instance, the price is escalated by 12% per acre which comes to 14% (for a period of 14 months). Consequently increasing the amount of Rs.41,23,711 by 14%, it comes to Rs.47,01,030.54/-. Since, the land in sale deed No.43 is not only located on the other side of the Delhi-Jaipur highway but is also located on the four legged intersection of the roads, therefore, it is considered appropriate to apply 20% deduction, to work out the market value of the acquired land upto the depth of one acre on the Delhi-Jaipur Highway. Thus, the said amount comes to Rs.37,60,825/- (rounded) per acre.

5.10 Now, this Bench proceeds to examine the land located on both sides of Bawal-Rewari road which passes through the acquired land. It is evident that the sale deeds bearing No.1272, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1285, 1286, 1316, 1770, are with respect to the tiny parcels of land located on Bawal-Rewari road which is an Inter District Road. It is also evident from

perusal of Ex.P14/1, a layout plan, that on both sides of the acquired parcel of land, commercial activity is being carried out. In fact, while coming from Delhi side, one is required to take a diversion for going towards Bawal and the bus stand of Bawal is located at a small distance from the National Highway. Then, there is commercial and residential area on both the sides of the road which has not been included in the said acquisition. Thereafter, towards the Eastern side of the road, the factory of Suraj Malt is located. Thus, the price of the land along side the aforesaid road would also be required to be assessed as commercial area upto the depth of two acres. No doubt, the sale exemplars bearing no. 1272, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1285, 1286, 1316, 1770 are with respect to significantly small parcels of land and are not worth relying upon to assess the market value of a significantly large area of acquired land, however, these sale deeds prove that the area abutting the Bawal-Rewari road has the potential to be utilized for commercial purposes. Hence, the same amount which has been assessed for the commercial area located alongside the Delhi-Jaipur highway is also assessed with respect to the land upto the depth of two acres on the Bawal-Rewari road.

5.11 Now, this Bench proceeds to examine the market value of the acquired land located away/ at a distance (beyond the depth of 2 acres) from the Delhi-Jaipur Highway as well as the Bawal-Rewari road. Before that, it may be noted here that there are two more roads, one goes towards village Nehchawa and the other towards village Harchandpur. However, these are only village roads and there is no evidence of any commercial activity in and around the aforesaid village roads.

5.12 On a careful perusal of Ex.P14/1, a layout plan, produced by the

landowners and the sale deed No.751 (Ex.RW3/60) dated 11.07.2006, it is evident that 30 kanals and 14 marlas of land has been sold for Rs.28,50,000/- (per acre price comes to Rs.7,42,671/-). This parcel of land measuring 30 kanals and 14 malras (nearly 4 acres of land) is comprised in Rect. No.17, 18, and 20. This forms a part of the acquired land. This parcel of land, also, is not located very far away from the Bawal-Rewari road. The various other sale exemplars produced by the owners as well as the HSIIDC are with respect to the land located at a distance from the acquired land. There is no evidence to prove that the parcels of land represented by the aforesaid sale exemplars are comparable. Whereas, in village Rudh, a sufficiently large area of acquired land represented by sale deed no.751 dated 11.07.2006 is comparable with the acquired land. The aforesaid sale exemplar is not only comparable but it also relates to the contemporaneous period. In fact, this is the best and the most reliable sale exemplar to assess the market value of the remaining acquired land which neither abuts the Delhi-Jaipur Highway nor abuts the Bawal-Rewari road. Even if we escalate the price by 10% increase for a period of one year, the amount would still not be comparable to the amount offered by the LAC.

5.13 It may be noted here that the argument of the learned senior counsel representing the landowners that the entire area has become commercial is not borne out from the court record. In fact, with respect to the revenue estate of Bawal, it is evident that various sale exemplars prove that the price of the land was in the range of Rs.5,00,000/- to Rs.16,00,000/- per acre. Similarly, the sale instances of village Rudh, Chirhara and Banipur also reflect that the price of the agricultural land was nowhere close to the amount offered by the LAC. Hence, the RC has erred in assessing the

market value of the acquired land on the basis of sale deeds bearing no.1316, 1770, 43 and 1065.

5.14 Now, this Bench proceeds to examine the argument of the learned senior counsel representing the landowners.

5.15 As far as placing reliance on sale deeds bearing no.1272, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1285, 1286, 1316, 1770, is concerned, these sale exemplars are with regard to significantly small parcels of land, therefore, they are held to be not comparable. As regards the argument of learned counsel that the entire area is developed, it may be noted that a sufficiently large parcel of land is being transacted at an average price ranging between Rs.12,00,000/- to Rs.13,00,000/- per acre.

5.16 The last argument of the learned counsel representing the appellant is with reference to sale deed no.43 dated 13.04.2006 by which, as already noticed, a corporate entity has purchased a commercial area, which is located at a four legged intersection of the two roads. Hence, it is not considered appropriate to rely upon the aforesaid sale exemplar and assess a uniform market value of the entire acquired land.

5.17 At this stage, it may be noted here that the learned counsel representing the landowners has drawn the attention of the court to allotment letter Ex.PW4/A vide which a three star hotel site has been sold by public auction. It has come on record that the highest bidder failed to pay the amount and the property reverted to the allotting authority. This plot is also a part of the already developed area. Thus, the aforesaid transaction did not reach a logical end. The learned counsel has also referred to the deposition of PW7 (Suresh Chand) and RW2 (Ashok Kumar). This court has carefully read the aforesaid deposition. Although, it has been stated that various

multinational companies are operating in the area and the prices of the land are likely to be on the higher side, however, once comparable sale exemplars are available on the court record, then, it is not appropriate to rely upon the oral evidence.

5.18 As regards the deposition of Sh. Ashok Kumar, HSIIDC official, it may be noted that his deposition does not advance the case of the landowners because he has simply admitted that Phase-I and Phase-II of the IMT, Rohtak has been developed.

6. **DECISION**

6.1 In view of the aforesaid detailed discussion, it is held that out of the acquired land, for the land located upto the depth of two acres on the Delhi-Jaipur Highway as well as the land located on both the sides of Bawal-Rewari road, the landowners shall be entitled to compensation @ Rs.37,60,825/-, whereas, for the remaining land, the applications filed by the concerned landowners, under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, shall stand dismissed. Consequently, the appeals filed by HSIIDC shall stand allowed with respect to the acquired land located in the interior i.e. remaining acquired land apart from the land located upto depth of two acres abutting the Delhi-Jaipur Highway and the land located on both the sides of Bawal-Rewari Road.

6.2 The learned counsels representing the parties did not address the court with regard to compensation for the acquisition of the structures. Hence, the aforesaid issue is not being examined in the judgment.

6.3 Consequently, all the appeals are disposed of.

13th September, 2022
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:YES/NO
:YES/NO

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party name
1.	RFA-608-2022	CHHAJU RAM SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-348-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DALPAT (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
3.	RFA-523-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S LEKH RAM AND ORS
4.	RFA-315-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MUNSHI LAL (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
5.	RFA-180-2022	LEKH RAM(DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
6.	RFA-532-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SAVITRI AND ORS
7.	RFA-332-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJESH AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-579-2022	HARDEWA SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-588-2022	RAM SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
10.	RFA-466-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHOOP SINGH AND ORS
11.	RFA-613-2022	DEVI RAM SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-355-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SUKHBIR SINGH AND ORS
13.	RFA-578-2022	HET RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
14.	RFA-465-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD THR ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY AND ORS
15.	RFA-605-2022	DEVI RAM SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
16.	RFA-580-2022	HARI SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
17.	RFA-604-2022	BALU RAM SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-535-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S PHOOL SINGH AND ORS
19.	RFA-472-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM CHANDER AND ORS
20.	RFA-536-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S OM PARKASH AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-451-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S PURAN MAL AND ORS

22.	RFA-398-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S NATHU AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-448-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MOHINDER SINGH AND ORS
24.	RFA-575-2022	SHEO RAM AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
25.	RFA-600-2022	SUNDER LAL DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-396-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. SANTOSH DEVI AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-256-2022	HIRA LAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-481-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DEVI RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS.
29.	RFA-475-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S CHAND RAM AND ORS
30.	RFA-595-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
31.	RFA-606-2022	SHISH RAM SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
32.	RFA-474-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BALU RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS.
33.	RFA-270-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM KANWAR (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
34.	RFA-502-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. MEENA AND ORS
35.	RFA-331-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S KANWAR SINGH AND OTHERS
36.	RFA-264-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. SANTOSH DEVI AND ORS
37.	RFA-446-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S GUGAN DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
38.	RFA-601-2022	RAJESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
39.	RFA-216-2022	BASTI RAM AND ANOTEHR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
40.	RFA-614-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ROOP CHAND AND OTHERS
41.	RFA-450-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAMESH CHAND (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
42.	RFA-215-2022	RAM NATH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
43.	RFA-227-2022	GANDA RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
44.	RFA-471-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. SANTOSH DEVI AND OTHERS

45.	RFA-310-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MUSADI LAL AND ORS
46.	RFA-527-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SURAT RAM AND ORS
47.	RFA-510-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S CHUNNI LAL (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
48.	RFA-186-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
49.	RFA-511-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SH. DHARAM SINGH AND ORS
50.	RFA-484-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BALBIR SINGH AND ORS
51.	RFA-253-2022	DAULAT RAM SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
52.	RFA-612-2022	RAJESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
53.	RFA-540-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS
54.	RFA-519-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DEVI RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
55.	RFA-550-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HUKAM AND ORS
56.	RFA-482-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DEVI RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
57.	RFA-447-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAGHBAR DAYAL AND ORS
58.	RFA-577-2022	RAJESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
59.	RFA-213-2022	BHOOP SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
60.	RFA-361-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ANIL KUMAR AND ORS
61.	RFA-226-2022	HIRA LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
62.	RFA-537-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DEVI RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
63.	RFA-576-2022	SURAT RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
64.	RFA-190-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
65.	RFA-468-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ROOP CHAND AND ORS
66.	RFA-563-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM KANWAR DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
67.	RFA-4311-2019	KARAN SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
68.	RFA-593-2022	AMAR SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

69.	RFA-589-2022	LEKH RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
70.	RFA-603-2022	HIRA LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
71.	RFA-443-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S AKHLA DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
72.	RFA-505-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND ORS
73.	RFA-275-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HIRA LAL AND ORS
74.	RFA-440-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SUBHASH CHAND AND ORS
75.	RFA-240-2022	PHOOL SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
76.	RFA-467-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DHARAMBIR AND ORS
77.	RFA-599-2022	RAM KANWAR DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
78.	RFA-191-2022	SAVITRI AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
79.	RFA-470-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MAHI RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS.
80.	RFA-684-2022	HAR DAYAL DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
81.	RFA-609-2022	BIRJU RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
82.	RFA-568-2022	GAJRAJ SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
83.	RFA-442-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HAR DAYAL AND ORS
84.	RFA-497-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HARKESH AND ORS
85.	RFA-552-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HUKAM SINGH AND ORS
86.	RFA-426-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND ORS
87.	RFA-522-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S PRIBHU DAYAL AND ORS
88.	RFA-539-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SURAT RAM AND OTHERS
89.	RFA-469-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HIRA LAL SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS.
90.	RFA-572-2022	VIJAY PAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
91.	RFA-252-2022	MOHAKAM RAM AND ANR V/S STATE OF

		HARYANA AND OTHERS
92.	RFA-477-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SHISH RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
93.	RFA-607-2022	DHAN SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
94.	RFA-581-2022	RAM KANWAR DECEASED THROUGH LRS HARI SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
95.	RFA-400-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJINDER SINGH AND OTHERS
96.	RFA-516-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HAR LAL DECEASED THROUGH LR AND ORS
97.	RFA-480-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJ KUMAR AND ORS
98.	RFA-591-2022	SUMER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
99.	RFA-330-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BALBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
100.	RFA-347-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S KARAN SINGH AND ORS
101.	RFA-242-2022	SHEO RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
102.	RFA-188-2022	SHER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
103.	RFA-218-2022	NATHU AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
104.	RFA-183-2022	SARDAR SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
105.	RFA-185-2022	ABHEY SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
106.	RFA-327-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S NAND RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
107.	RFA-280-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BIRJU RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
108.	RFA-615-2022	ROOP CHAND AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
109.	RFA-587-2022	DULI CHAND (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
110.	RFA-320-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SHER SINGH AND ORS
111.	RFA-584-2022	RAJINDER @ RAJENDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA
112.	RFA-478-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. VIJAY KUMARI AND ORS

113.	RFA-329-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. ASHARFI (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
114.	RFA-189-2022	SARDAR SINGH(DEEASED) THR LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
115.	RFA-513-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HET RAM AND ORS
116.	RFA-258-2022	MOHAKAM RAM AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
117.	RFA-538-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BIMLA DEVI AND OTHERS
118.	RFA-351-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SUKHBIR SINGH AND ORS
119.	RFA-403-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S AMAR SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
120.	RFA-409-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT. LTD. THR. ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY SHRI VINEET MAHESHWARI AND ORS
121.	RFA-590-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
122.	RFA-449-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SUNDER LAL (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
123.	RFA-583-2022	SUMER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
124.	RFA-182-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
125.	RFA-571-2022	HIRA LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
126.	RFA-255-2022	HARNARIAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
127.	RFA-245-2022	GUGAN SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
128.	RFA-596-2022	RAM KANWAR (DECEASED) TH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
129.	RFA-541-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHUPENDER AND OTHERS
130.	RFA-212-2022	SURAT RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
131.	RFA-224-2022	SHER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
132.	RFA-611-2022	HARDHYAN SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

133.	RFA-248-2022	ROOP CHAND V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
134.	RFA-243-2022	PHOOL SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
135.	RFA-244-2022	AKHLA SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
136.	RFA-406-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM KANWAR (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
137.	RFA-508-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SURAJ MAL AND ORS
138.	RFA-479-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. KITAB KAUR AND ORS
139.	RFA-247-2022	DHARAM CHAND AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
140.	RFA-323-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS
141.	RFA-261-2022	ATTAR SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
142.	RFA-610-2022	DEVI RAM SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
143.	RFA-582-2022	VED RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
144.	RFA-586-2022	ISHWAR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
145.	RFA-594-2022	RAM KANWAR (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
146.	RFA-217-2022	DHARAMBIR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
147.	RFA-473-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S CHAJJU RAM DECEASED TH LRS AND ORS
148.	RFA-358-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SHEO RAM AND ORS
149.	RFA-249-2022	MAHI RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
150.	RFA-181-2022	ISHWER SINGH @ ISHWAR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
151.	RFA-184-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
152.	RFA-266-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S GRAM PANCHAYAT RUDH AND ORS

153.	RFA-214-2022	HUKAM SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
154.	RFA-246-2022	ATTAR SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
155.	RFA-597-2022	RAM KANWAR (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
156.	RFA-602-2022	SMT. MEENA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
157.	RFA-566-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S BHIM SINGH AND OTHERS
158.	RFA-311-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S MOHAKAM RAM AND ORS
159.	RFA-574-2022	MUSADI LAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
160.	RFA-179-2022	RAM PAT THROUGH LR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
161.	RFA-225-2022	HIRA LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
162.	RFA-592-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
163.	RFA-585-2022	RAM PAT (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
164.	RFA-365-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND ORS
165.	RFA-268-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S VED RAM AND OTHERS
166.	RFA-598-2022	BALU RAM DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
167.	RFA-259-2022	BALA DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
168.	RFA-274-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S JAGDISH AND ORS
169.	RFA-328-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S RAM PAT DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
170.	RFA-818-2022	MS MANOJ PAPERS LLP FORMALLY KNOWN AS MANOJ PAPERS THR. ITS GPA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
171.	RFA-47-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S SUMER SINGH AND ORS
172.	RFA-80-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S SUMER SINGH AND OTHERS
173.	RFA-98-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S BASTI RAM AND OTHERS
174.	RFA-831-2022	NAND RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS

		AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
175.	RFA-821-2022	MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD THR ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
176.	RFA-26-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MOHAKAM RAM AND OTHERS
177.	RFA-51-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJESH AND OTHERS
178.	RFA-90-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJESH AND OTHERS
179.	RFA-93-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAMPAT AND OTHERS
180.	RFA-85-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BALBIR SINGH AND ORS
181.	RFA-827-2022	MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD THR ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
182.	RFA-59-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. RAMRATI AND ORS
183.	RFA-62-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HIRA LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
184.	RFA-793-2022	RAJINDER SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
185.	RFA-55-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ISHWAR SINGH AND ORS
186.	RFA-811-2022	MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD THR ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
187.	RFA-826-2022	SMT. ASHARFI THROUGH HER LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
188.	RFA-34-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S GAJRAJ SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
189.	RFA-875-2022	PRITHVY SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
190.	RFA-33-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S M/S MANOJ PAPERS PVT. LTD. THR. ITS GPA MANISH SHARMA AND OTHERS
191.	RFA-97-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM KANWAR (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
192.	RFA-87-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS
193.	RFA-84-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ABHEY SINGH AND ORS
194.	RFA-39-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HIRA LAL AND OTHERS
195.	RFA-69-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM NIWAS AND ORS
196.	RFA-64-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S YOGESH AND OTHERS
197.	RFA-825-2022	MOHINDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

198.	RFA-830-2022	SURAJ MAL (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
199.	RFA-58-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. ANJULA AND ORS
200.	RFA-48-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHUPENDER SINGH AND OTHERS
201.	RFA-66-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HARKESH AND OTHERS
202.	RFA-833-2022	SURAJ MAL (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
203.	RFA-795-2022	BHUPENDER SINGH, DECEASED, THROUGH LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
204.	RFA-45-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ISHWER SINGH AND OTHERS
205.	RFA-27-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S GANGA DEEN SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
206.	RFA-43-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HERDEWA AND OTHERS
207.	RFA-792-2022	RAM CHANDER AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
208.	RFA-35-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DAULAT RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
209.	RFA-61-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ASHARFI (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS RAJ SINGH AND OTHERS
210.	RFA-815-2022	SUKHBIR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
211.	RFA-73-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. MANKAURI AND ORS
212.	RFA-828-2022	OM PARKASH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
213.	RFA-780-2022	HAR LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
214.	RFA-94-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM KANWAR (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
215.	RFA-41-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S NAND RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS SURAJ MAL AND OTHERS
216.	RFA-95-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DHARAM CHAND AND OTHERS
217.	RFA-823-2022	SMT. RAMRATI AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
218.	RFA-829-2022	JAI NARAIN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
219.	RFA-96-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S JAI NARAIN AND OTHERS

220.	RFA-86-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HARNARAIN AND ORS
221.	RFA-36-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RATI RAM AND OTHERS
222.	RFA-44-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD THR. ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY SHRI VINEET MAHESHWARI AND ORS
223.	RFA-68-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BIMLA DEVI AND ORS
224.	RFA-50-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. SUDESH AND OTHERS
225.	RFA-74-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S PHOOL SINGH AND OTHERS
226.	RFA-82-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. RAMRATI AND ORS
227.	RFA-40-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BIRJU RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LR HARI KISHAN AND OTHERS
228.	RFA-79-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHUPENDER SINGH AND ORS
229.	RFA-812-2022	MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD THR. ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
230.	RFA-67-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DALPAT(DECEASED) THR LR AND ORS
231.	RFA-817-2022	MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
232.	RFA-37-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM NATH AND OTHERS
233.	RFA-834-2022	NAND RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
234.	RFA-70-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAMPAT DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
235.	RFA-91-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT. LIMITED AND OTHERS
236.	RFA-42-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT LTD THR ITS LEGAL ATTORNEY SHRI VINEET MAHESHWARI AND OTHERS
237.	RFA-824-2022	BIMLA DEVI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
238.	RFA-56-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S AKHLA (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
239.	RFA-63-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJESH AND OTHERS
240.	RFA-54-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BALBIR AND OTHERS
241.	RFA-75-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJ KUMAR AND ORS
242.	RFA-789-2022	GIRDHARI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
243.	RFA-83-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. KIRN AND OTHERS

244.	RFA-78-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SHEO RAM AND OTHERS
245.	RFA-52-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S PRIBHU DAYAL AND OTHERS
246.	RFA-71-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAM SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
247.	RFA-822-2022	SMT. SUDESH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
248.	RFA-29-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DALPAT SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
249.	RFA-38-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SHER SINGH AND OTHERS
250.	RFA-32-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S HIRA LAL (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
251.	RFA-49-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S ATTAR SINGH AND OTHERS
252.	RFA-76-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S LEKH RAM AND OTHERS
253.	RFA-57-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHOOP SINGH AND ORS
254.	RFA-31-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DHAN SINGH AND OTHERS
255.	RFA-89-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S PRITHVY SINGH AND ORS
256.	RFA-72-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S DULI CHAND DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS
257.	RFA-30-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS
258.	RFA-65-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S RAJENDER KUMAR AND ORS
259.	RFA-796-2022	SMT. VIJAY KUMARI AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
260.	RFA-100-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S MERLIN LAND AND HOUSING PVT. LIMITED AND OTHERS
261.	RFA-46-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S GUGAN (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
262.	RFA-816-2022	KANWAR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
263.	RFA-77-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BHARAT SINGH AND ORS
264.	RFA-788-2022	HARKESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
265.	RFA-279-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SURAJ MAL AND ORS
266.	RFA-53-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SARDAR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
267.	RFA-92-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S SMT. BALA DEVI AND OTHERS
268.	RFA-102-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BALU RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
269.	RFA-60-2022	HSI IDC Ltd. V/S BALBIR SINGH AND OTHERS
270.	RFA-794-2022	BHUPENDER SINGH, DECEASED, THROUGH LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA

		AND ORS
271.	RFA-28-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S SARDAR SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
272.	RFA-99-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S HARI SINGH AND OTHERS
273.	RFA-81-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S SURAT RAM AND OTHERS
274.	RFA-88-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S ATTAR SINGH AND OTHERS
275.	RFA-272-2022	HSIIDC Ltd. V/S SHER SINGH AND ORS