In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 180 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.07.2022
Reserved On: 09.05.2022

Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Sabdal 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) calls into question the correctness of the award passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as "the RC") on 27.02.2020. The Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as "the HSIIDC") and the landowners have filed the appeals. The notification under Section 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act and the awards passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as "the LAC") as also the RC is common. The learned counsel representing the parties are *ad idem* that this batch of appeals can be decided 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 432 kanals and 17 marlas of land located in village **Kherli Kankar**, Tehsil Nuh, District Mewat
5.	Number and Date of the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector.	No.13 dated 26.06.2006 acquiring the lands comprised in Rectangle No. 22, 23, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 47 and 48.
6.	Amount assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector.	₹12,50,000/- per acre.
7.	Amount determined by the Reference Court.	The RC, on 29.10.2010, in the first round, dismissed the applications under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. However, the High Court, on 31.01.2019, in ***Om Parkash v. State of Haryana and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 3552 of 2010)***, remitted back the matter to the RC for fresh decision.
8.	Amount determined by the Reference Court.	The RC, vide judgment dated 27.02.2020, has assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹21,44,849/- per acre.

1.3 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?

1.4 The landowners, in order to project the potential of the land, have asserted on the similar lines as in the case of village Dingerheri in ***Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited v. Suraj Mal and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 11 of 2021, decided on 07.07.2022)***. The relevant pleadings are 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"

1.5 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."

1.6 On examination of the pleadings, the RC has framed 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) Relief"

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 Yaseen	Petitioner.
2.	PW.2 Taj Khan	Petitioner.
3.	PW.3 Khurshid	Petitioner.
4.	PW.4 Jaikam Khan	Registration Clerk.
5.	PW.5 Abdul Rahim	Petitioner.
6.	PW.6 Jameel Ahmad	Patwari.
7.	PW.7 Haseen Ahmed	Draftsman.
8.	PW.8 Jaikam Khan	Registration Clerk.
9.	PW.9 Imran Khan	Petitioner.

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

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Exh.P4	Aks Sizra of village Kherli Kankar
2.	Exh.P5	Site plan
3.	Exh.PX	Certified copy of award dated 5.2.2020
4.	Exh.PY	Final development plan of Sohna

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the Witness
1.	RW.1 Deen Mohammad	Patwari.
2.	RW.2 Subash	Registration Clerk.

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

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Exh.R5	Market rate of Divisional Level Committee
2.	Exh.R6	Judgment dated 1.5.2010
3.	Exh.R17	Circle rate of the year 2004-2005
4.	Exh.R18	Circle rate of the year 2005-2006
5.	Exh.R19	Circle rate of the year 2006-2007
6.	Exh.R20	Aks Sizra/Site plan

3. The RC, while wrongly interpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act, has refused to rely upon the sale instances Ex.R1 to Ex.R8, Ex.R10 and Ex.R11, respectively, on the ground that the price is lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. The RC, after noticing that the landowners have failed to produce any sale deed of a parcel of land located in village Kherli Kankar, relied upon the sale instance (Ex.P9) with respect to 10 marlas of plot, which is located in village Rewasan. The RC, after finding that village Rewasan is located on the national highway, whereas, village Kherli Kankar is situated in the interior belt, at the first instance, reduced the price by 50% and then, cumulatively increased the amount @ 12% per annum for the time gap between the sale deed dated 26.06.2003 and the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 29.09.2005. The RC has arrived at a figure of ₹23,80,943/- per acre. Thereafter, the RC applied 10% development cut and arrived at a figure of ₹21,44,849/- per acre.

4. Heard the learned counsel representing the parties, at length and with their able assistance, perused the paper-book as well as the record of the Reference Court, which was requisitioned.

5. The learned senior counsel representing the HSIIDC has also filed the synopsis along with the gist of his arguments.

6. The learned counsel representing the landowners contend that the RC has erred in applying 50% deduction and thereafter, applying cut of 10%. They contend that the RC should have relied upon the sale instance (Ex.P9) to assess the market value of the acquired land. Per contra, the learned senior counsel representing the HSIIDC contends that the RC has erred in refusing to take into consideration the sale instances produced by the HSIIDC, particularly Ex.R1 to Ex.R8, Ex.R10 and Ex.R11. He further contends that once the sale exemplars of nearby land of the village, itself, were produced, there was no occasion to rely upon the sale instance (Ex.P9) which is with respect to a small plot.

7. <u>Discussion by this Court</u>

<u>Issue No.(i)</u>

7.1 After having heard the learned counsel representing the parties and on perusal of the record of the RC, which was requisitioned, it is evident that the RC has committed the following error:-

> The sale exemplars (Ex.R1 to Ex.R8, Ex.R10 and Ex.R11) could not be kept out of consideration while assessing the market value. The RC has misinterpreted Section 25 of the 1894 Act. It is well settled that the sale exemplar reflecting a price lower than the amount assessed by the LAC cannot be kept out of consideration. The RC is only debarred from assessing the market value lower than the amount awarded 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***.

7.2 At this stage, it would be appropriate to take a note of the various sale exemplars produce by the respective parties. The RC has compiled the information with regard to exemplar sale deeds produced by both the parties, correctness whereof, is not disputed by the learned counsel representing the parties. Hence, the same is extracted as under:-

Sr. No.	*Exhibit No.*	*Vasika No.*	*Dated*	*Sale Consideration (In Rs.)*	*Land Sold (K M S)*	*Rate per acre*	*Village*
1.	P1	780	24.5.2007	3,25,000	0-13-0	40,00,000	Rewasan
2.	P2	2415	09.09.2005	9,50,000	500 sq. yards	91,96,000	Rojka Meo
3.	P3	3427	24.11.2005	50,00,000	1000 sq. yards	2,42,00,000	Rojka Meo
4.	P4	1483	26.10.1999	32,000	0-4-0	12,80,000	Rupaheri
5.	P5	447	30.05.2001	53,000	0-5-0	16,96,000	Rupaheri
6.	P6	780	24.05.2007	3,25,000	0-13-0	40,00,000	Rewasan
7.	P7	713	23.06.2003	2,30,000	0-10-0	36,80,000	Rewasan
8.	P8	3427	24.11.2005	50,00,000	1000 sq. yards	2,42,00,000	Rojka Meo
9.	P9	1178	15.6.2005	10,17,500	52-10-0	1,55,047	Kherli Kankar
10.	P10	247	12.10.2004	85,000	8-0-0	85,000	Kherli Kankar
11.	R1	2672	27.9.2005	4,00,000	20-0-0	1,60,000	Kherli Kankar
12.	R2	2556	16.9.2005	8,85,436	45-15-0	1,54,830	Kherli Kankar
13.	R3	2070	1.10.2004	2,13,000	10-19-0	1,55,616	Kherli Kankar
14.	R4	2186	12.10.2004	85,000	8-0-0	85,000	Kherli Kankar
15.	R8	2187	12.10.2004	1,43,500	13-10-0	85,037	Kherli Kankar
16.	R9	2748	3.10.2005	16,30,000	43-9-0	3,00,115	Bhirawati
17.	R10	5115	9.3.2006	10,57,000	43-19-0	1,92,400	Kherli Kankar
18.	R11	2748	10.1.2005	3,90,000	35-14-0	87,394	Kherli Kankar
19.	R12	167	26.4.2005	10,42,000	31-9-0	2,65,055	Indri
20.	R13	1721	13.7.2005	15,62,000	47-3-0	2,65,026	Indri
21.	R14	706	25.5.2005	7,25,000	21-17-0	2,65,446	Indri
22.	R15	2552	10.12.2004	2,80,000	8-0-0	2,80,000	Khalilpur
23.	R16	2653	26.9.2005	4,07,000	6-10-0	5,00,923	Atta

<u>Note:</u> 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.

7.3 On a careful perusal thereof, it is evident that the landowners have not produced any sale exemplar of the land located in village Kherli Kankar, whereas, the HSIIDC has produced as many as seven sale deeds of different parcels of land located in the same village in order to prove their case. The RC has committed an error in relying upon the sale instance (Ex.P9) dated 23.06.2003 with respect to the plot measuring 10 marlas. On a careful examination of the sale exemplar (Ex.P9), it is evident that it is not with respect to the agricultural land in Kherli Kankar but is with respect to a *gair mumkin* land in village Rewasan. Such land is located either in the residential area or near the residential area. Thus, the aforesaid sale instance is not comparable.

7.4 Further, it is evident from a perusal of the tabulated information that in village Kherli Kankar, large chunks of land were being sold in the price ranging from ₹85,000/- to ₹1,60,000/- per acre. The sale exemplar (Ex.R1) is three months prior to the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. More than 8½ acres of land has been sold @ ₹1,55,047/- per acre. A perusal of the sale deed shows that the land forms a part of the land comprised in rectangle No. 13, 33 and 34. Some part of the land comprised in rectangle No. 34 has also been acquired. From a perusal of the sale instance (Ex.R6), it is evident that the land measuring more than 1 acre has been sold @ ₹1,55,616/-. Similarly, Ex.R3 is a sale instance of 2 ½ acres of land which was sold just two days prior to the date of notification under

Section 4 of the 1894 Act. This sale instance is with respect to the land sold from rectangle No. 13 and 49. The land comprised in rectangle No. 48 is the subject matter of acquisition. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the parcel of land sold through the sale deed (Ex.R3) is abutting the acquired land. In the presence of the overwhelming evidence to prove the market value of the acquired land in village Kherli Kankar, the RC has committed an error in relying upon the sale instance of a plot of 10 marlas (302 square yards) located in an entirely different village. Ordinarily, the area of an acre of land is 4840 square yards. The learned counsel representing the landowners have failed to draw the attention of the Court to any material to prove that the sale instance (Ex.P9) is comparable. Furthermore, as already noticed, this parcel of the plot is not with respect to the agricultural land.

7.5 Now, let us examine the argument advanced by the learned counsel representing the landowners in relation to development cut. It would be noted here that this Court has found that the sale exemplar (Ex.P9) cannot be relied upon in the absence of evidence to prove that it pertains to a comparable sale deed of contemporaneous period. Hence, the validity of the development cut at two different stages becomes academic, therefore, needs no further elaboration.

7.6 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, this Court comes to a conclusion that the RC has erred in enhancing the market value of the acquired land from ₹12,50,000/- to ₹ 17,50,000/-. Therefore, 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 is ₹12,50,000/- as assessed by the LAC, which requires no interference. Hence, the issue No.(i) stands answered.

<u>Issue No. (ii)</u>

7.7 The issue No. (ii) has also been elaborately discussed while deciding the case of village Dingerheri in ***Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited v. Suraj Mal and Others*** *(supra)*, the relevant discussion 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* ***HSIIDC 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 HSIIDC 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."

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

8. <u>Decision</u>

8.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the conclusion is inevitable. The award passed by the RC is set aside, whereas, the award of the LAC is restored. The applications filed by the landowners under Section 18 of the 1894 Act shall stand dismissed except the damages for severance of the acquisitioned land as per discussion under issue No. (ii). The appeals filed by the HSIIDC shall stand allowed.

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

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

July 08, 2022
"DK"

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

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party's Name
1.	RFA No.181 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Khushi Mohd. and others

2.	RFA No.182 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hamida and others
3.	RFA No.183 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Ramjan (deceased) through his LRs and others
4.	RFA No.184 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sharif (deceased) through his LRs and others
5.	RFA No.185 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Tayyab Hussain and others
6.	RFA No.186 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Bagdal and others
7.	RFA No.187 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Salim Khan and others
8.	RFA No.188 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mohammad @ Bhim and others
9.	RFA No.189 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Israil (deceased) through his LRs and others
10.	RFA No.190 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Khubi and others
11.	RFA No.191 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Umar Mohd. and others
12.	RFA No.192 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sumer Khan and others
13.	RFA No.193 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hussaina deceased through LRs and others
14.	RFA No.194 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Rozdar and others

15.	RFA No.195 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Noor Mohd. and others
16.	RFA No.196 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Saroop Khan deceased through his LRs and others.
17.	RFA No.197 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Nabnly and others
18.	RFA No.198 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Usman Khan and others
19.	RFA No.199 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mohd. Yakub and others
20.	RFA No.200 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hussaina deceased through LRs and others
21.	RFA No.201 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Khurshid and others
22.	RFA No.202 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hussaina deceased through LRs and others
23.	RFA No.203 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hussain Khan and others
24.	RFA No.204 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Illyas and others
25.	RFA No.205 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sharif deceased through his LRs and others
26.	RFA No.206 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Abdul Rahim and others
27.	RFA No.207 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Noor Mohd. and others

28.	RFA No.208 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sher Mohd. and others
29.	RFA No.209 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Suleman deceased through his LRs and others
30.	RFA No.210 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Suleman deceased through his LRs and others
31.	RFA No.211 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Illiyas deceased through LRs and others
32.	RFA No.212 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Illiyas deceased through LRs and others
33.	RFA No.213 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Shitab and others
34.	RFA No.214 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Umar Mohd. and others
35.	RFA No.215 of 2021	Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Suleman deceased through LRs and others
36.	RFA No.1373 of 2021	Mohd. Yakub and others Versus State of Haryana and others

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

July 08, 2022
"DK"