**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**

**Regular First Appeal No. 239 of 2021 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 08.07.2022**
**Reserved On: 07.05.2022**

Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Mohammad Safi 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 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 judgment dated 05.05.2020, passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as "the RC"). 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 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 315 kanals and 8 marlas of land located in village **Rewasan**, Tehsil Nuh, District Mewat. |
| 5. | Number and Date of the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector. | No.14 dated 30.06.2006 acquiring the lands comprised in Rectangle No. 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29 and 30. |
| 6. | Amount assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector. | ₹12,50,000/- per acre. |
| 7. | Amount determined by the Reference Court. | The RC, on 01.05.2010, 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 05.02.2020, the RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹42,87,519/- 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 For describing the location of the acquired land, the pleadings of the landowners are common with the land located in 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)***. Hence, the same 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 The RC, on the appreciation of 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 L.A. Act? OPP.*

*2) Whether the petitions are time barred? OPR*

*3) 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. | PW1 Sachin Kumar | -- |
| 2. | PW2 Zakir Hussain | -- |
| 3. | PW3 Sehjad | -- |
| 4. | PW4 Haseen Ahmed | Draftsman. |
| 5. | PW5 Mohd. Sabbir | Halqa Patwari. |
| 6. | PW6 Kifayat Khan | Assistant Manager, HSIIDC, Nuh. |
| 7. | PW7 Jaikam Khan | -- |
| 8. | PW8 Chander Khan | -- |

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

| Sr. No. | Exhibit Number | Description of the document |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Exh.P1 | Site plan of village Rewasan |
| 2. | Exh.P2 | Aks Sizra of village Rewasan |
| 3. | Exh.P3 | Layour plan of IMT Sohna |
| 4. | Mark A | N.O.C. |
| 5. | Exh.P8 | Linear Plan Delhi-Alwar road |
| 6. | Exh.P9 | Judgment dated 4.4.2018. |

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 Jaikam Khan | -- |

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

| Sr. No. | Exhibit Number | Description of the document |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Exh.R3 | Divisional Committee Report on |

| Sr. No. | Exhibit Number | Description of the document |
|---|---|---|
| | | Market Price |
| 2. | Exh.R4 | Judgment dated 13.6.2019 (sic) |
| 3. | Exh.R12 | Aks Sizra of Village Rewasan |

**3. Discussion by this Court**

**Issue No. (i)**

3.1 The RC has held that the sale deeds (Ex.R1, Ex.R2 and Ex.R4 to Ex.R11) cannot be made the basis for determination of the market value in view of Section 25 of the 1894 Act. The RC held that these sale deeds cannot be relied upon because the price reflected in the aforesaid sale deeds is less than the amount assessed by the LAC. The sale deeds (Ex.PW.3/B, Ex. PW.3/F, Ex.P4 and Ex.P5) are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, therefore, the same are not relied upon. Similarly, the sale deed (Ex.P6) was also liable to be ignored on that account. The RC relied upon the sale deed (Ex.P7) with respect to the plot measuring 10 marlas. The RC proceeded to award cumulative increase 12% per year for the time gap of 2 years, 3 months and 6 days while assessing the amount @ ₹47,46,909/-. Thereafter, the RC applied 10% cut in order to arrive at the market value of the acquired land @ ₹42,87,519/- per acre. The RC also awarded the compensation for severance of the land @ 50% per annum, if the remaining unacquired remnant land is less than 1 acre.

3.2 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. The learned senior counsel representing the landowners have also filed the brief notes of submissions.

3.3 The learned counsel representing the landowners have submitted that the alignment of the acquired land for proposed Kundli-

Manesar-Palwal Expressway in village Rewasan is passing diagonally through the National Highway-1248A i.e. Delhi-Jaipur Highway and the developed industrial area of Rojka Meo, Tehsil Nuh, District Mewat, is located on the Delhi-Jaipur Highway, whereas, the proposed land for acquisition of land for IMT Manesar is situated between the developed industrial area in Rojka Meo and the acquired land for Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway. The learned counsel relies upon the sale deed (Ex.P6) with respect to plot No. 45 in the developed industrial area of Rojka Meo. The learned counsel also relied upon the sale instance (Ex.P7) which has been relied upon by the RC.

3.4 Per contra, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC, while assailing the correctness of the judgment passed by the RC, has submitted that the sale instances produced by them have been wrongly ignored by misinterpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act. He further contends that the RC has also erred in relying upon a sale instance of a very small piece of land measuring 10 marlas only. While summing up, he has submitted that the assessment made by the LAC was correct and there was no scope for enhancement.

3.5 At this stage, it would be appropriate to extract a tabulated compilation of relevant information with respect to the various sale exemplars produced by the respective parties, prepared by the RC, which is as under:-

| *Sr. No.* | *Exhibit No.* | *Vasika No.* | *Dated* | *Sale Consideration (In Rs.)* | *Land Sold (K M S)* | *Rate per acre* | *Village* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *1.* | *PW3/B* | *3727* | *24.11.05* | *50,00,000* | *1000 sq. mtr.* | *2,02,34,282* | *Rewasan* |

| *Sr. No.* | *Exhibit No.* | *Vasika No.* | *Dated* | *Sale Consideration (In Rs.)* | *Land Sold (K M S)* | *Rate per acre* | *Village* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *2.* | *PW3/C* | *3280* | *16.11.05* | *21,43,000* | *1000 sq. mtr.* | *86,72,413* | *Rewasam* |
| *3.* | *PW3/D* | *1185* | *30.07.08* | *1,76,96,250* | *42-18-0* | *33,00,000* | *Hirmathla* |
| *4.* | *PW3/E* | *198* | *25.04.08* | *1,82,000* | *0-10-0* | *29,12,000* | *Kanwarsika* |
| *5.* | *PW3/F* | *2415* | *09.09.05* | *9,50,000* | *450 sq. mtr.* | *85,43,355* | *Rewasan* |
| *6.* | *P4* | *780* | *24.05.07* | *3,25,000* | *0-13-0* | *40,00,000* | *Rewasan* |
| *7.* | *P5* | *576* | *16.05.07* | *6,00,000* | *1-2-0* | *43,63,636* | *Rewasan* |
| *8.* | *P6* | *3727* | *24.11.05* | *50,00,000* | *1000 sq. mtr.* | *2,02,34,282* | *Rewasan* |
| *9.* | *P7* | *713* | *23.06.03* | *2,30,000* | *0-10-0* | *36,80,000* | *Rewasan* |
| *10.* | *R1* | *2067* | *1.10.2004* | *2,26,000* | *9K 1M* | *1,99,779* | *Rewasan* |
| *11.* | *R2* | *2900* | *10.2.2005* | *5,42,000* | *16K 13M* | *2,60,420* | *Rewasan* |
| *12.* | *R4* | *2970* | *18.2.2005* | *1,80,000* | *8K 0M* | *1,80,000* | *Khalilpur* |
| *13.* | *R5* | *4448* | *23.1.2006* | *1,60,000* | *12K 10M* | *1,02,400* | *Rewasan* |
| *14.* | *R6* | *4382* | *19.1.2006* | *6,00,000* | *16K 0M* | *3,00,000* | *Rewasan* |
| *15.* | *R7* | *3689* | *9.12.2005* | *4,15,000* | *12K 06M* | *2,69,918* | *Rewasan* |
| *16.* | *R8* | *3078* | *27.10.2005* | *75,000* | *0K 17M* | *7,05,882* | *Maroda* |
| *17.* | *R9* | *77* | *6.4.2007* | *7,73,000* | *5K 3M* | *12,00,776* | *Rewasan* |
| *18.* | *R10* | *2318* | *1.9.2005* | *14,69,000* | *4K 19M* | *2,79,476* | *Khalilpur* |
| *19.* | *R11* | *8* | *31.3.2006* | *2,47,500* | *6K 13M* | *2,97,744* | *Indri* |

**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.

3.6 It would be noted here that some part of the land of village Rewasan was acquired for developing the Industrial Model Township of Rojka Meo. It is evident that the sale instance (Ex.PW.3/B, Ex.PW.3/C, Ex.PW.3/D, Ex.PW.3/E, Ex.P4, Ex.P5 and Ex.P6) are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, which in the present case was issued on 29.09.2005. The sale instance (Ex.PW.3/F) is 20 days before the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, however, it pertains to the developed Industrial Area of Rojka Meo. It is also with respect to a very small industrial plot, hence, cannot be relied upon to assess the market value of the agricultural land.

3.7 Now, let us examine the sale instance produced by the HSIIDC. Ex.R2 is the sale instance of more than 2 acres of land out of the land comprised in rectangle No. 32, 46 and 41. Ex.R5 is a sale instance of the land measuring more than 1½ acres sold out of the land comprised in rectangle No. 12. The sale instances (Ex.R6 and Ex.R7) are with respect to the land comprised in rectangle No. 16 and 17, respectively. The sale instance (Ex.R9), which is more than 1½ years after the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act is with respect to the land comprised in rectangle No. 20. The acquired land is also a part of rectangle No.20. In other words, even after more than two years from the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, the land was being sold @ ₹12,00,776/- per acre, whereas the LAC has assessed the market value @ ₹12,50,000/- per acre.

3.8 Now, let us analyze the reasons given by the RC. The first reason is the result of misinterpretation of Section 25 of the 1894 Act. The aforesaid question 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***. The second reason assigned by the RC is with reference to the sale deed (Ex.P7). The RC has taken it to be a sale deed of agricultural land which is against the record. It is evident that the aforesaid land has been described as *gair mumkin gait*. It means that it is a non-agricultural land located in or near the residential area of the village. Hence, the RC has committed an error in relying upon the same.

3.9 Now, let us analyze the arguments of learned counsel representing the landowners. No doubt, the acquired land for the proposed Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway is passing diagonally to National Highway-1248A Delhi-Jaipur Highway, however, that by itself is not sufficient to assess the market value of the acquired land. The second argument is with regard to the location of the acquired land near IMT Manesar. In the considered view of this Court, such argument is without any basis, therefore, needs no further elaboration.

3.10 The next argument of the learned counsel is for placing reliance on the sale deed (Ex.P6). This is a sale deed of 1000 square meter plot in the developed Industrial Model Township Rojka Meo. It is not appropriate to rely upon the price of such developed plot particularly when the various sale deeds of the agricultural land are available. The next argument of the learned counsel is with regard to the sale instance (Ex.P7) dated 23.06.2003 which has already been discussed elaborately.

3.11 On a careful perusal of a layout plan (Ex.R12), it is evident that village Rojka Meo is at a distance of 4 to 5 Kms. from the acquired land in village Rewasan. Furthermore, the various parcels of the land represented vide sale deeds (Ex.R5 to Ex.R7 and Ex.R9) are located close the acquired land. Moreover, the land mentioned in the sale instance (Ex.R9) is at a distance of less than 1 acre from the acquired land. It is evident that the sale exemplar (Ex.R9) is more than two years after the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Thus, the RC has committed an error in assessing the market value of the acquired land on the basis of the sale deed (Ex.P7) which is not only located on the Delhi-Jaipur Highway, but also at a sufficient distance from the acquired land.

3.12 The learned counsel representing the landowners has also filed additional written submissions. In the aforesaid additional submissions, it has been pointed out that the small plots can also be relied upon to assess the market value of the acquired land. It would be noted here that there is absolutely no doubt about the aforesaid position. However, it is a case where the comparable sale instances of contemporaneous period have been produced by the HSIIDC. The sale deed of a small parcel of the developed plot cannot be preferred over and above the comparable sale instances of the contemporaneous period.

3.13 On a careful perusal of the tabulated compilation, it is evident that the parties have failed to produce any evidence of comparable sale deed to enable the Court to arrive at a definite finding. It is not necessary that in each and every case, the Court must re-assess the market value even in the absence of evidence. 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.

**Issue No. (ii)**

3.14 The RC has granted severance charges @ 50% per annum. It has been ordered that if the unacquired land remained with the landowner is less than 1 acre, he shall be entitled to 50% market value of the aforesaid parcel of the land. This matter has been examined, in detail, while deciding the cases relating to 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."*

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

**4. Decision**

4.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, the result is inevitable. The assessment made by the LAC is upheld, whereas the assessment of the market value of the acquired land made by the RC as well as the compensation on account of severance charges is set aside. It is declared that the landowners shall be entitled to the same amount of compensation as assessed by the LAC. However, they shall be entitled to 20% of the compensation on account of severance of the land in accordance with the discussion in the cases relating to village Dingerheri in the case ***Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited v. Suraj Mal and Others*** *(supra)*.

4.2 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.239 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mohd. Safi and others |
| 2. | RFA No.240 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Jakir and others |
| 3. | RFA No.241 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Kamruddin and others |
| 4. | RFA No.242 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Om Parkash and others |
| 5. | RFA No.243 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hanif and others |
| 6. | RFA No.244 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Shahid and others |
| 7. | RFA No.245 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Jom Khan and others |
| 8. | RFA No.246 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hasmal and others |
| 9. | RFA No.247 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Islam and others |
| 10. | RFA No.248 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Israil and others |
| 11. | RFA No.249 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.250 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Ishey Khan and others |
| 13. | RFA No.251 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Chao Khan and others |
| 14. | RFA No.252 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hasan Mohd. and others |
| 15. | RFA No.253 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Hamid and others |
| 16. | RFA No.254 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Yasin Khan and others |
| 17. | RFA No.255 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sibbu and others |
| 18. | RFA No.256 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mohar Khan and others |
| 19. | RFA No.257 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mohd. Sarif and others |
| 20. | RFA No.258 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sandeep Kumar and others |
| 21. | RFA No.259 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Niyaj Mohd. and others |
| 22. | RFA No.260 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Noor Mohd. and others |
| 23. | RFA No.261 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Iliyas and others |
| 24. | RFA No.262 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sarjit and others |
| 25. | RFA No.263 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Sachin and others |
| 26. | RFA No.264 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mehmooda and others |
| 27. | RFA No.265 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Ahmed and others |
| 28. | RFA No.266 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mohar Khan and others |
| 29. | RFA No.267 of 2021 | Haryana State Industrial and infrastructure Development Corporation Limited, Sector 6, Panchkula (HSIIDC) through its AGM. Versus Mohar Khan and others |
| 30. | RFA No.1189 of 2021 | Om Parkash Versus State of Haryana and Others |
| 31. | RFA No.1204 of 2021 | Hasmal through his LRs Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 32. | RFA No.1211 of 2021 | Mohd. Sarif Versus State of Haryana and Others |
| 33. | RFA No.1227 of 2021 | Hanif and another Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 34. | RFA No.1238 of 2021 | Mohar Khan through his LRs and others Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 35. | RFA No.1242 of 2021 | Sachin Kumar and another Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 36. | RFA No.1249 of 2021 | Sarjit through his LRs Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 37. | RFA No.1255 of 2021 | Shahid Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 38. | RFA No.1261 of 2021 | Ahmed and others Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 39. | RFA No.1277 of 2021 | Umar Mohd. Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 40. | RFA No.1278 of 2021 | Jom Khan through his LRs Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 41. | RFA No.1279 of 2021 | Hamid Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 42. | RFA No.1280 of 2021 | Mehmooda through his LRs Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 43. | RFA No.1281 of 2021 | Niyaj Mohd. and others Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 44. | RFA No.1332 of 2021 | Mohar Khan through his LRs and another Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 45. | RFA No.1365 of 2021 | Chao Khan and another Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 46. | RFA No.1419 of 2021 | Jakir and others Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 47. | RFA No.1433 of 2021 | Ishey Khan and others Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 48. | RFA No.1436 of 2021 | Yasin Khan and another Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 49. | RFA No.1439 of 2021 | Israil and others Versus State of Haryana and others |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 50. | RFA No.1538 of 2021 | Islam and another Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 51. | RFA No.2105 of 2021 | Iliyas Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 52. | RFA No.2109 of 2021 | Noor Mohd. and another Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 53. | RFA No.2335 of 2021 | Hasan Mohd. now deceased through his LRs and others Versus State of Haryana and others |
| 54. | RFA No.2537 of 2021 | Mohd. Safi through his LRs and others Versus State of Haryana and others |

**(Anil Kshetarpal)**
**Judge**

**July 08, 2022**
**"DK"**