

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 32 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 06.07.2022

Reserved On: 07.05.2022

Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation
Limited

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Om Parkash and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

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

Mr. Shailendra Jain, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Satyendra Chauhan and Mr. Jagtar Singh, Advocates.

Mr. Karan Nehra, Ms Sandeep Kaur, Mr. Abhay Josan,
Mr. Harvinder Thakur, Mr. Sushil K. Sharma,
Mr. M.L.Sharma, Mr. Varun Gupta, Mr. J.S.Yadav,
Mr. Gulshan Nandwani, Mr. Himanshu Sharma and
Mr. Amit Jain, Advocates, for the landowners.

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

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 This batch of appeals (detail whereof is at the foot of the judgment) has been filed by the Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as “the HSIIDC”) as well as the landowners, while questioning the correctness of the common

to as “the RC”). The notification under Section 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1894 Act”) and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as “the LAC”) as also the RC are common. Hence, the learned counsel representing the parties are *ad idem* that this batch of appeals can be conveniently disposed of by a common judgment.

1.2 The relevant particulars, for the purpose of decision of the present case, are as under:-

S.NO.	TITLE	DETAILS
1.	Date of Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act.	29.09.2005
2.	Date of Notification under Section 6 of the 1894 Act.	15.12.2005
3.	Purpose of Acquisition.	For construction of Express Highway connecting NH-1, 10, 8 and 2.
4.	Location, area and nature of the acquired land	Proposing to acquire the land measuring 354 kanals and 2 marlas of land located in village Kalwari , Tehsil Tauru, District Mewat.
5.	Number and Date of the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector.	No.1 dated 11.05.2006 acquiring the lands comprised in Rectangle No. 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23 and 24
6.	Amount assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector.	₹12,50,000/- per acre.
7.	Amount determined by the Reference Court.	The RC, on 02.02.2010 in the first round, dismissed the applications under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. However, the High Court remanded the case back to the RC for fresh decision.
8.	Date of re-decision of the RC and the amount re-assessed, after remand.	Vide judgment dated 29.02.2020, the RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹20,99,999/- per acre.

land, the pleadings of the landowners as well as the HSIIDC are common with the cases arising from village Dingerheri, which is extracted as under:-

“On the applications filed under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, the LAC has referred the matter to the RC for assessment of the market value of the acquired land. It was claimed that the market value of the acquired land is approximately ₹1,00,00,000/- per acre and the LAC did not take into consideration the location, nature and the vicinity of the land in question to other landmark places. It is claimed that the National Highway No.8 and 10 are at a distance of only 6 Kms. The Industrial Model Town, Manesar (hereinafter referred to as “the IMT”) is 10 kms. away from the village. The Gurugram city is only 20 kms. away from the village. Several industries, residential sectors, commercial institutions, farm houses and poultry farms surround the village. It is also claimed that there is a pucca road leading to the land in question and the LAC has failed to take notice of the fact that the acquired land is located near Tauru city and there existed tube-wells, rooms, barbed wire fencing, underground water pipe lines, valuable trees etc. The LAC also failed to take into consideration that the State Government has already acquired the land in the revenue estates of villages Manesar, Kasan etc. and these areas are located near the acquired land. The landowners also claim that the townships, namely Pataudi, Sohna, Tauru, Nuh, Bhiwari, Manesar and Gurugram city are within a distance

around 5 to 30 kms. from the acquired land and the land has great potential for residential and commercial development. There exist several petrol pumps, markets, resorts, golf courses, factories, farm houses and commercial and educational institutions in Manesar, Pachgaon, Pataudi, Tauru, Bhiwari, Sohna, Nuh, Gurugram and Palwal”

1.4 The HSIIDC has also taken the same stand as in the pleadings in the case of village Dingerheri, which are extracted as under:-

“Per contra, the HSIIDC took a stand that the LAC has already awarded excessive compensation, therefore, there is no scope for re-determination. It is stated that the IMT, Manesar is at a significant distance. Moreover, the acquired land is not chahi (not giving two crops in a year) land in nature.”

1.5 The RC, on appreciation of the pleadings, has culled out the following issues:-

- “1) What was the market value of the acquired land on the date of notification under Section 4 of Land Acquisition Act? OPP.*
- 2) Whether petitions are time barred? OPR*
- 3) Relief”.*

1.6 In the considered view of this Court, the following issues need determination:-

- i) What was the appropriate market value of the acquired land on the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act i.e. 29.09.2005?

ii) What should be the compensation for severance in case the land remaining with the owner stands bifurcated in more than two or more parcels due to the acquisition of the land for the construction of a highway?

2. Evidence Produced by the Parties

2.1 In oral evidence, the landowners, in order to prove their case, have examined the following witnesses:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the Witness
1.	PW.1 Raja Ram	--
2.	PW.2 Ram Kanwar	Petitioner
3.	PW.3 Satbir Singh	Petitioner
4.	PW.4 Jabbar Khan	Retired Patwari
5.	PW.5 Jaikam Khan	Registry Clerk
6.	PW.6 Jai Bhagwan	Halqa Patwari
7.	PW.7 Mohd. Sabir	Halqa Patwari
8.	PW.8 Devender Singh	Halqa Patwari
9.	PW.9 Jameel Ahmed	Patwari
10.	PW.10 Haseen Ahmed	Draftsman
11.	PW.11 Kashi Ram Dahiya	Draftsman
12.	PW.12 Tej Pal	Petitioner

2.2 In documentary evidence, the landowners have also produced the following documents:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Exh.PW6/A	Aks Sizra of village Indri
2.	Exh.PW7/A	Aks Sizra of village Rewasan
3.	Exh.PW8/A	Aks Sizra of village Bahadri
4.	Exh.PW9/A	Aks Sizra of village Kherli Kankar
5.	Exh.PW10/A	Site plan of acquired land of village Rewasan
6.	Exh.PW10/B	Site plan of acquired land of village Kherli Kankar

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
7.	Exh.PW10/C	Site plan of acquired land of village Indri
8.	Exh.PW10/D	Site plan of acquired land of village Bahadri
9.	Exh.PW11/A	Site plan

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the Witness
1.	RW.1 Deen Mohammad	Patwari.
2.	RW.1 (marked twice) Subash	Registry Clerk

2.4 In documentary evidence, the HSIIDC, has also produced the following documents in its documentary evidence:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Exh.R3	Market rate and order dated 13.6.2009
2.	Exh.R4	Order dated 21.11.2009
3.	Exh.R5	Market rate

3. At this stage, it would be appropriate to extract below a tabulated compilation, prepared by the Reference Court containing relevant information with respect to the various sale exemplars produced by the respective parties:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Vasika No.	Dated	Sale Consideration (In Rs.)	Land Sold (K M S)	Rate per acre	Village
1.	P1	7877	14.7.2005	1,55,06,000	32-13-0	37,99,326	Pathreri
2.	P2	790	12.04.2005	61,68,750	16-9-0	30,00,000	Pathreri
3.	P3	4961	2.6.2004	55,64,000	32-0-0	13,91,000	Pathreri
4.	P4	12001	7.9.2004	28,16,775	16-4-0	13,91,000	Pathreri
5.	PW12/1	1895	14.12.2005	7,00,000	1-16-0	31,11,111	Pada
6.	PW12/2	1467	2.8.2006	3,49,87,500	62-4-0	45,00,000	Fatehpur
7.	PW5/A	3427	24.11.2005	50,00,000	1000 sq . yards	2,42,00,000	Rojka Meo
	PW5/B	576	16.5.2007	6,00,000	1-2-0	43,63,636	Rewasan

**Regular First Appeal No. 32 of 2021 (O&M)
And Other Connected Appeals**

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Exhibit No.</i>	<i>Vasika No.</i>	<i>Dated</i>	<i>Sale Consideration (In Rs.)</i>	<i>Land Sold (K M S)</i>	<i>Rate per acre</i>	<i>Village</i>
9.	PW5/C	703	22.05.2007	24,00,000	5-9-0	32,22,935	Indri
10.	PW5/D	780	24.05.2007	3,25,000	0-13-0	40,00,000	Rewasan
11.	PW5/E	713	23.6.2003	2,30,000	0-10-0	36,80,000	Rewasan
12.	R1	15	6.4.2005	90,000	1-18-0	3,78,947	Kalwari
13.	R2	534	13.6.2005	75,000	1-11-0	3,87,096	Kalwari
14.	R1 (marked twice)	1507	7.8.2006	1,00,000	0-16-0	10,00,000	Kalwari
15.	R2 (marked twice)	3242	5.2.2007	55,000	0-8.5-0	10,35,294	Kalwari
16.	R3	1606	8.11.2005	5,00,000	8-0-0	5,00,000	Hasanpur
17.	R4	1619	9.11.2005	4,20,000	4-13-0	7,22,580	Tauru
18.	R5	3330	15.2.2007	19,25,000	15-8-0	10,00,000	Jhamuwas
19.	R6	1211	14.9.2005	2,35,000	6-17-0	2,74,452	Sabras
20.	R7	1409	14.10.2005	2,31,875	5-6-0	3,50,000	Tauru
21.	R8	1491	23.12.2004	60,000	2-0-0	2,40,000	Sabras
22.	R9	2033	30.12.2005	2,40,000	7-11-0	2,54,304	Jhamuwas
23.	R10	1738	28.8.2006	4,00,000	8-3-0	3,92,638	Gudhi

Note: The correctness of the above extracted tabulated compilation of the sale deeds by the RC, has not been disputed by the learned counsel representing the parties.

4. On the careful examination of the judgment passed by the RC, the following findings emerged:-

- I) The market value assessed by the LAC is contradicted by the evidence led by the HSIIDC, therefore, the sale exemplars (Ex.R1 to Ex.R10), which are reflecting a price below the amount assessed by the LAC cannot be relied upon.
- II) The proceedings dated 26.04.2006 of the Divisional Level Price Fixation Committees is without considering

the sale deeds of the area, therefore, it cannot be relied upon.

III) The sale deeds (Ex.R1 to Ex.R10) produced by the HSIIDC are either below the amount offered by the LAC or of the period subsequent to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, hence, cannot be relied upon.

IV) The RC ultimately relies upon the sale deed (Ex.PW.12/1) dated 14.12.2005 with respect to a plot measuring 1090 square yards sold @ ₹31,11,111/- per acre . The RC, thereafter, found that 50% deduction is required to be made but proceeds to apply 25% deduction without giving any reason. In para 35 of its judgment, the RC has held that appropriate deduction would be 50%, whereas in para 36, it applied deduction of 25%. Thereafter, the RC further applied 10% as development cut to arrive at a figure of ₹20,99,999/-. The RC also awarded the compensation for severance if the remaining unacquired land left with the owner is less than 1 acre.

5. Heard the learned counsel representing the parties, at length and with their able assistance, perused the judgments passed by the RC as well as the record of the RC, which was requisitioned.

6. The learned counsel representing the landowners contend that the RC has erred in applying the development cut at two different stages i.e.

that a comparable sale deed of contemporaneous period has been produced, then, no development cut was applicable.

7. On the other hand, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC has contended that the RC has wrongly ignored the sale deeds (Ex.R1 and Ex.R2) which are with respect to the parcels of the land sold in village Kalwari. He has further contended that in the absence of evidence, the RC should not have relied upon the sale deed (Ex.PW.12/1) which is not at all comparable with the acquired land to assess the market value of the acquired land located in village Kalwari.

8. Discussion by the Court

Issue No. (i)

8.1 As regards the first reason assigned by the RC, it would be noted that there is no contradiction. The LAC has assessed the market value of the acquired land by taking into consideration the various factors. It is evident that on 29.09.2005, the land located in as many as 15 villages was sought to be acquired by issuing a notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Vide separate awards passed by the LAC, a uniform amount of ₹12,50,000/- per acre was assessed. In these circumstances, the amount assessed by the LAC is not contradicted by evidence led by the HSIIDC.

8.2 As regards the second reason, it would be noted that undoubtedly, the minutes of the proceedings of the Divisional Level Price Fixation Committee do not reflect that the sale deeds of the area were considered or the spot was inspected before making recommendations, however, the Court is required to assess the market value on appreciation of evidence independent from the assessment of the Divisional Level Price

Fixation Committee.

8.3 As regards the next reason, it would be noted that Section 25 of the 1894 Act does not debar the Court from taking into consideration the sale deeds produced by the parties reflecting a price lower than the amount offered by the LAC. Section 25 of the 1894 Act only restricts the Courts from awarding an amount lower than the amount offered by the LAC. This issue is no longer *res integra* in view of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in ***Lal Chand vs. Union of India, (2009) 15 SCC 769***. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the RC has wrongly ignored the sale deeds of village Kalwari (Ex.R1 and Ex.R2), respectively. The acquired land forms a part of the land comprised in rectangle No. 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23 and 24, whereas the sale instance (Ex.R1) is with respect to the land out of the rectangle No. 28 and the sale instance (Ex.R2) is with respect to the land out of rectangle No. 4 and 9. A bare look at the layout plan (Ex.R11) shows that the parcels of land sold through the sale deeds (Ex.R1 and Ex.R2) are located close to the acquired land.

8.4 The RC has relied upon the sale deed (Ex.PW.12/1) dated 14.12.2005 with respect to the land located in village Pada. It would be noted here that this sale instance is post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. It is also with respect to a very small parcel of land. A careful perusal of the sale deed (Ex.PW.12/1) reflect that the aforesaid sale instance is with respect to a constructed house consisting of three rooms, a kitchen and a bathroom. The RC has overlooked the aforesaid fact. Once the sale deed (Ex.PW.12/1) is proved to be of a residential

of the agricultural land is wrong.

8.5 It is evident that the landowners have failed to produce the sale instances of village Kalwari and there is no evidence to rebut the sale deeds (Ex.R1 and Ex.R2) produced by the HSIIDC. Hence, this Court does not find it appropriate to rely upon the sale instance (Ex.PW.12/1). Hence, the issue No.(i) stands answered.

Issue No.(ii)

8.6 With regard to the compensation for severance, no evidence has been led by the parties except producing the layout plan which shows that a few parcels of the land stand bifurcated due to the acquisition of a narrow strip of land for the purpose of constructing an express highway. The RC has relied upon the judgment passed in ***State of Haryana v. Rajinder Kumar 2000 (1) LACC 360*** and ***Smt.Bindu Garg v. State of Haryana 1999 (2) RCR (Civil) 261***. This matter has been discussed, in detail, in the cases arising from village Dingerheri, the relevant portion is extracted as under:-

*“9.11 The third issue which arises for consideration has already been noticed above. A narrow strip of land has been acquired for constructing an express highway. The landowners have claimed damages for severance/bifurcation of their land into two or more parcels. It has been projected that due to acquisition of the narrow strip of land, the remaining land of certain landowners is located on both the sides of expressway. The RC, after relying upon the judgments passed in ***State of Haryana v. Rajinder Kumar 2000 (1) LACC 360*** and ***Smt.Bindu Garg v. State of Haryana 1999 (2) RCR (Civil) 261****

*has assessed the damages on account of severance @ 50%. It would be noted here that there is no clarity as to whether such amount @ 50% is with respect to the acquired land or unacquired land. Moreover, the Court has not analyzed the evidence to prove the damages, if any, suffered by the landowners. The RC has committed an error in blindly following the judgment passed by the Court without analyzing its facts. In **Rajinder Kumar's case** (supra), the land was acquired for construction of a railway over-bridge. The market value of the acquired land located adjacent to the railway over-bridge was substantially reduced due to difficulty in accessing the unacquired remnant land. In that context, the Court awarded 50% compensation for the remaining unacquired land. Similarly, in **Smt.Bindu Garg's case** (supra), the Court found that the remaining unacquired land has been rendered completely inaccessible and has resulted in complete loss. In that context, the Court awarded 50% of the market value on account of damages suffered due to severance of the unacquired land. In the present case, no evidence to assess the quantum of damages, on account of severance, has been led. The judgments relied upon by the RC were not applicable. However, this Court cannot overlook that the landowners must have suffered some amount of damages or loss on account of severance or the bifurcation of the unacquired land into two or more parcels. With respect to similar acquisition of land for the*

*same expressway i.e. Kundali-Maneser-Palwal Expressway, this Court, in **HSI IDC vs. Rattan Singh and Others (RFA-5620-2013, decided on 05.10.2021)**, held as under:-*

“The next issue which requires adjudication is regarding the proper and appropriate compensation/damages for the severance of the land in two parts. Clause (3) of Section 23 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, enables the Court to order the payment of the damage sustained by the person on account of severance from other land. In the present case, the acquisition of the aforementioned land is for the construction of the express highway. A long strip of land has been acquired. In the cases arising from village Mehndipur, the official of the HSI IDC has himself admitted that the land of various owners stands divided in two independent unconnected parcels due to the compulsory acquisition of the land. Although, the land owners have failed to lead any evidence to prove the extent of loss/damage suffered by them, even in that case, it is clear cut/indisputable that the owners would have difficulty in accessing the parcels of separate land across the road. Some of the land owners may have been left with only a small portion on one side of the road, whereas remaining part is on the other side of the road. In any case, it would become uneconomical and hard to

cultivate and irrigate a small piece of land which is left on the one side of the Road. It may be noted here that in the appeals arising from the reference applications of the acquisition of the land located at village Daboda Khurd, the reference court has assessed the damages for severance of the land to the extent of 20% with regard to market value of the acquired or unacquired land whichever is less. The State or the HSIIDC have not filed any appeals. In other words, they have accepted the judgments. The HSIIDC has filed appeals in the cases arising from the acquisition made at village Mehndipur, where surprisingly the same Presiding Judge has ordered the 50% of the market value of the acquired land towards the severance charges. In this case, Chand Singh appeared as PW1 on behalf of the land owners. He did not depose about the loss suffered by the owners on account of severance of the unacquired land. However, when Bhagwan Singh Rana deposed on behalf of HSIIDC, he admitted that Smt. Bala, Balraj, Dharam Singh, Kapoor Singh, Dilbagh Singh, Ram Singh, Priti Singh and Munshi etc. have suffered loss on account of the fact that their unacquired/remaining land stands sundered due to the construction of the road (Expressway). In other words, these owners are now left with unacquired land which is in two separate

independent parcels. They will be required to make special arrangements for irrigation and cultivation of land in the both the parcels of land situated on both the sides of the road which will be a hardship to them. Hence, the Court cannot deprive the owners from damages on account of the severance, merely because the owners have failed to lead any evidence to prove the extent of loss/damages suffered by them. However, there is no evidence to prove that the owners have suffered damages to the extent of 50% of the market value of the acquired land. Furthermore, there is no appeal by the State and the HSIIDC in the appeals arising from the acquisition made at village Daboda Khurd.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the appeals filed by the HSIIDC are allowed to the extent that the owners of villages Mehendipur shall also be entitled to the damages for severance of the land to the extent of 20% of the market value of the acquired or unacquired land whichever is less. However, the Executing Court is directed to ascertain as to whether the land of a particular owner stood bisected or not, before ordering the payment of damages for the severance of the land.

*The learned counsel representing the owners have relied upon the judgments passed in **Narender Kaur and Gurbachan Singh (supra)**. In both the judgments, the*

Court after coming to a conclusion that some part of the acquired land is virtually lost as it is rendered inaccessible and uneconomical, assessed the severance charges at @ 50%. As already noticed in this case, no such evidence has been led by the landowners to prove that fact. In these cases, it has come on record that the unacquired land of certain owners stands separated/bisected into two different parcels due to construction of the road”.

9.12 *Following the aforesaid view, the landowners shall also be entitled to damages for severance on the same lines. Thus, the third issue is also substantially answered.*

9.13 *Further, this Court affirm the observation of the RC that damages for severance or the compensation on account of severance shall only be granted in regard to the land comprised in khasra numbers, which have been severed on account of acquisition and the remnant land is less than an acre.”*

8.7 For the reasons recorded above, the issue No. (ii) stands substantially answered.

9. Decision

9.1 Consequently, the appeals filed by the HSIIDC are allowed, whereas that of the landowners shall stand dismissed. In fact, the applications filed under Section 18 of the 1894 by the landowners are dismissed except the amount payable as damages for severance of their

unacquired remnant land.

9.2 The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, in all the appeals, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

July 06, 2022
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party’s Name
1.	RFA-391-2021	OM PARKASH AND OTHERS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-392-2021	OM PARKASH AND OTHER VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
3.	RFA-393-2021	OM PARKASH AND OTHERS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
4.	RFA-394-2021	OM PARKASH AND OTHERS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
5.	RFA-395-2021	OM PARKASH AND OTHERS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
6.	RFA-1307-2021	SHER SINGH AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
7.	RFA-1309-2021	SHYAMU (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
8.	RFA-1312-2021	RAM KANWAR AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
9.	RFA-1314-2021	RAM KANWAR AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
10.	RFA-1315-2021	SURENDER KUMAR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
11.	RFA-1331-2021	AMAR SINGH THROUGH HIS LRS. AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
12.	RFA-1346-2021	SHYAMU (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
13.	RFA-1353-2021	RAM KANWAR AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
14.	RFA-1372-2021	SHER SINGH AND ANRS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party’s Name
15.	RFA-1407-2021	SHYAMU (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
16.	RFA-1241-2021	AMAR SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS. AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
17.	RFA-34-2021	HSI IDC VS. RAM KANWAR AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-33-2021	HSI IDC VS. OM PARKASH AND OTHERS
19.	RFA-35-2021	HSI IDC VS. SHYAMU (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-36-2021	HSI IDC VS. RAM KANWAR AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-37-2021	HSI IDC VS. OM PARKASH AND OTHERS
22.	RFA-38-2021	HSI IDC VS. SHER SINGH AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-39-2021	HSI IDC VS. SHYAMU DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
24.	RFA-40-2021	HSI IDC VS. RAM KANWAR AND OTHERS
25.	RFA-41-2021	HSI IDC VS. DHARAM PAL AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-42-2021	HSI IDC VS. AMAR SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-43-2021	HSI IDC VS. AMAR SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-44-2021	HSI IDC VS. SHER SINGH AND OTHERS
29.	RFA-45-2021	HSI IDC VS. SHYAMU DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
30.	RFA-46-2021	HSI IDC VS. OM PARKASH AND OTHERS
31.	RFA-47-2021	HSI IDC VS. OM PARKASH AND OTHERS

July 06, 2022
“DK”

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge