

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sr. No.	Contents		Page No.
1.	Introduction		1 - 2
2.	Facts		2 - 5
3.	The Issues which arise for adjudication		5 - 6
4.	Oral and documentary evidence		6 - 11
5.	Reasons and Analysis Of Judgment dated 28.10.2016 passed by the RC in the First Acquisition.		12 - 18
	5.1	Reasons	12 - 15
	5.2	Analysis of the above mentioned reasons.	15 - 18
6.	Reasons and Analysis Of Judgment dated 09.11.2016 passed by the RC in the Second Acquisition.		18 - 24
	6.1	Reasons	18 - 20
	6.2	Analysis of the above mentioned reasons.	21 - 24
7.	Arguments addressed by the learned counsels		24 - 27
8.	Discussion and Analysis by this Court		27 - 43
	8.1	History of acquisition	27 - 28
	8.2	Determination of Issue No.I	29
	8.3	Determination of Issue No.II(a).	29 – 34
	8.4	Determination of Issue No.II(b).	34 - 43
9.	Decision		44

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.01.2022

State of Haryana and Another

... Appellant(s)

Versus

Baljinder Kaur

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana and
Ms. Vibha Tewari, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. G.S.Bal, Senior Advocate with Mr. Sewa Singh, Advocate
Mr. Jasmer Chand, Advocate
Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Ishan Singh Cooner, Advocate
Mr. Jagram Singh Cooner, Advocate
Mr. Gaurav Sethi, Advocate
Mr. Bhag Singh, Advocate
Mr. M.L. Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Sushil K. Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Yadvinder Singh Turka, Advocate
Mr. Abhishek Goel and Mr. Parmod Chauhan, Advocate
for Mr. Vijay Dhiman, Advocate
Mr. Deepk Singh Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the landowners.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 By this judgment, a batch of regular first appeals (details whereof are at the foot of the judgment) filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1894 Act”) with respect to the adjoining parcels of the acquired land, located in the villages, namely Jandli, Kanwali, Kanwala, Saunda and Sarai Mehdood, shall stand

disposed of. Although, the land has been acquired by two separate notifications, however, keeping in view the fact that both the acquisitions are with respect to the adjoining pieces of the land in the same area, the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act is in the same year, the assessment of the market value by the Land Acquisition Officer (hereinafter referred to as “the LAC”) as well the award passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as “the RC”) is almost identical, the evidence led by the landowners is more or less the same and the learned counsel representing the parties are not only common, but even their arguments, in the concerned cases, are the same, therefore, it is considered appropriate to dispose of the aforesaid appeals by a common judgment.

2. FACTS

2.1 Before this Bench proceeds to discuss the evidence, produced by the respective parties, some relevant particulars, with regard to both the acquisitions, are required to be noticed.

The 1st Acquisition (For developing Sector 23):-

- i) 28.02.2006- Notification U/s 4 of the 1894 Act proposing to acquire the land in the villages, namely Jandli (165.13 acres), Kanwli (50.45 acres), Saunda (33.91 acres) and Sarai Mehdood (3.86 acres) for developing a residential and commercial colony, namely Sector 23 by the Haryana Urban Development Authority, Haryana (hereinafter referred to as “the HUDA”) was issued.
- ii) 27.02.2007 -The notification under Section 6 of the 1894 Act was issued.

- iii) 03.03.2009- Award No. 4 with respect to 87.55 acres of land was announced, while offering to pay, to the landowners of village Jandali, an amount @ ₹10,00,000/- per acre, whereas the landowners of the acquired land of the villages, namely Kanwli, Saunda and Sarai Mehdood, were offered an amount @ ₹8,00,000/- per acre.
- iv) 29.08.2014:- The RC, in the first round, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 2,950/- per square yard vide judgment dated 29.08.2014. Accordingly, the per acre price works out to ₹1,42,78,000/-.
- v) 28.10.2016:- The date of re-decision, after remand, by the RC.

The Second Acquisition(For developing Sector 22):-

- i) 20.07.2006: The notification U/s 4 of the 1894 Act was issued proposing to acquire the land of villages- Kanwla, Kanwali, Jandli and Sarai Mehdood for developing Sector 22 by the HUDA.
- ii) 19.07.2007: The declaration under Section 6 of the 1894 Act was issued.
- iii) 17.07.2009: The LAC vide award No. 3 dated 17.07.2009 offered to pay, to the landowners of village Jandali, an amount @ ₹10,00,000/- per acre, whereas the landowners of the acquired land of the villages, namely Kanwla, Kanwali and Sarai Mehdood were offered an amount @ ₹8,00,000/- per acre.

- iv) 24.04.2012: In the first round, the RC assessed the market value of the acquired land on the date of the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act @ ₹499/- per square yard, vide judgment dated 24.04.2012. Accordingly, the per acre price works out to ₹24,15,160/-.
- v) 09.11.2016, 25.03.2019 & 16.04.2021: The date of re-decision, after remand, by the RC in different batches vide judgments dated 09.11.2016, 25.03.2019 & 16.04.2021.

2.2 While delivering the judgment on 15.10.2015 in ***Harinder Kumar and Another v. State of Haryana (Regular First Appeal No. 3120 of 2011)***, a batch of the regular first appeals with respect to the 1st and 2nd acquisition were decided and the cases were remanded back to the RC for deciding afresh after permitting the parties to lead further evidence. The Court noticed that the layout plan (Ex.PW.6/D) produced by the landowners, is attractive, but misleading. It was noticed that on the scrutiny of the layout plan, it appears that the railway station and the bus stand of Ambala Cantonment are near to the acquired land but it has not been clarified as to whether the aforesaid distance is by a crow fly or by road. It is important to note that the acquired land is located in the town which is the hometown of the Presiding Judge at the High Court in the first round.

2.3 After remand by the High Court, the RC permitted the parties to lead further evidence. With regard to the first acquisition for the residential colony of Sector 23, HUDA, the RC has assessed the market value of the

acquired land in the following manner:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Market Value of the acquired Land (In ₹)	Rate of the land per square yard (In ₹)
1.	Jandli	43,56,000/-	900 /-
2.	Kanwli	49,65,840/-	1,026/-
3.	Saunda	50,82,900/-	1,050/-
4.	Sarai Mehdood	19,36,000/-	400/-

2.4 In the second acquisition, the RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land, more or less on similar lines, in the following manner:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Village	Market Value of the acquired Land (In ₹)	Rate of the acquired land per square yard (In ₹)
1.	Jandli	43,56,000/-	900 /-
2.	Kanwli	49,65,840/-	1,026/-
3.	Kanwla	49,65,840/-	1,026/-
4.	Sarai Mehdood	19,36,000/-	400/-

2.5 The RC has decided these reference petitions by different judgments while assessing the same amount. In the first acquisition, the matter has been decided by the judgment dated 28.10.2016, whereas with respect to the second acquisition, the RC has decided the cases in different batches, vide judgments dated 09.11.2016, 24.03.2019 and 16.04.2021, respectively.

3. THE ISSUES WHICH ARISE FOR ADJUDICATION

3.1 In the considered opinion of the Court, the following two issues require adjudication:-

- I) Whether the sale exemplars depicting price less than the amount assessed by the LAC are liable to be ignored while assessing the market value of the acquired land?

- II) Which, out of the following two methods, should be preferred to assess the market value of the acquired land:-
- a) The comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period with respect to the parcels of the land, either forming part of the acquired land or located nearby? or
 - b) The judicial assessment of the market value of the land located nearby which was acquired by a separate acquisition proceedings?

4. **ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE**

4.1 In the first acquisition, the landowners have examined the following witnesses:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the witness
1.	PW.1 Rajesh Kalyan	Clerk in the office of the Sub Registrar.
2.	PW.2 Rajinder Kumar	Patwari
3.	PW.3 Pawan Kumar	Patwari
4.	PW.4 Karnail Singh	Patwari
5.	PW.5 Bachan Singh	Building Clerk
6.	PW.6 Sohan Singh	
7.	PW.7 Surinder Mohan Mittal	Registered Architect
8.	PW.8 Puneet Pandit	Field Investigator
9.	PW.9 Vijay Singh	Photographer
10.	PW.10 Manisha Manocha	

4.2 PW.6 Sohan Singh and PW.10 Manisha Manocha are the owners of the land, whereas as many as three Patwaris, one Registered Architect and a Registration Clerk have been examined on behalf of the landowners. Apart from the aforesaid, Arvind Pal Singh has appeared in his own case. Apart from the sale instances, the landowners have produced the

following documentary evidence as noticed by the RC, the correctness whereof has not been disputed by the learned counsel representing the parties:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the document
1.	Ex.P1	Certified copy of judgment passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana in LPA No. 1340 of 1982 titled as Om Parkash Versus State of Haryana decided 28.11.1990.
2.	Ex.P2	Certified copy of the broucher of Sector 10 HUDA Ambala City.
3.	Ex.P3	Certified copy of the allotment letter no. 3612 dated 8.1.1981 pertaining to Booth No. 185 situated at New Grain Market, Ambala City.
4.	Ex.P4	Certified copy of Booth auctionedon 8.1.1979 situated at New Grain Market, Ambala City.
5.	Ex.P5	Certified copy of the judgment passed by the Court of Shri V.M. Jain, the then learned Addl. Distt. Judge, Ambala in LAC case No. 201 of 2004 titled as Sudesh Kumar Versus State of Haryana decided on 12.11.1984.
6.	Ex.P6	Copy of judgment passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 11030 of 2013 titled as Kashmir Singh Versus State of Haryana etc. decided on 13.12.2013.
7.	Ex.P28	Copy of judgment passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana in RFA No. 5605 of 2009 (O&M) titled as State of Haryana Versus Gurdeep Singh and another decided on 5.8.2015 related to notification of the year 2000.
8.	Ex.P29	Attested copy of judgment passed in LPA No. 366 of 1999 titled as Surinder Kumar Versus State of Haryana decided on 07.12.2005.
9.	Ex.P30	Attested copy of judgment passed by the Hon’ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana in LPA 292 of 1999 titled as Manohar Lal Khurana Versus State of Haryana decided on 22.2.2006.
10.	Ex.P31	Attested copy of letter of allotment dated 24.10.1990 of shop-cum-Flat/Booths/Plots in Scheme No. 19 of Ambala Improvement Trust, Ambala City.
11.	Ex.P32	Attested copy of allotment letter dated 13.06.2016 relating to site/booth, sitauted at village Kanwla, in Sector 22(27), Ambala City.
12.	Ex.P33	Site plan of the acquired land and its surroundings.

4.3 On the other hand, the respondents have examined RW.1

Rajinder Singh, Patwari and produced the various sale deeds of the villages, namely Saunda, Sarai Mehdood and Jandali.

4.4 In the second acquisition, the landowners have examined the following witnesses:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the witness
1.	PW.1 Nirmail Chand	Patwari
2.	PW.2 Pawan Kumar	Patwari
3.	PW.3 Mahesh Chander Jindal	
4.	PW.4 Samat Singh	Patwari
5.	PW.5 Vikash Sharma	Registration Clerk from the office of the Sub Registrar, Ambala
6.	PW.6 Surinder Mohan Mittal	Architect
7.	PW.7 Yashpal	Photographer
8.	PW.8 Dalbir Singh	Landowner
9.	PW.9 Maninder Singh	Landowner

4.5 On the other hand, Inderjit Singh, Naib Tehsildar, in the Office of the LAC, Haryana, appeared as RW.1. The State also produced the sale deeds of the various parcels of the land located in the villages, namely Kanwla, Kanwali and some other villages.

4.6 At this stage, it would be important to compile a consolidated list of the sale deeds/sale exemplars, produced by the respective parties in the villages, namely Kanwali, Kanwala, Jandali, Sarai Mahmoodpur, Saunda, Ambala City and Mandor, in order to help the Court to assess the market value of the land as on 28.02.2006 and 20.07.2006.

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos. in various files	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price	Price Per Acre
<u>KANWALI</u> <u>(Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)</u>						
1.	A-18	947	01.05.2006	371 Sq. Yards	2,97,000	38,74,609
2.	RC, R-3, R-4	3988	04.07.2005	4K	3,00,000	6,00,000

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos. in various files	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price	Price Per Acre
3.	RD, R-4, R-5	2927	03.07.2006	9A-6K-14M	68,86,250	6,91,217.06
4.	RF, R-7	1549	16.05.2005	5K-7M	4,02,000	6,01,121
KANWALA (Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)						
5.	P-23, A-16	8571	14.11.2005	208 Sq. Yards	4,27,000	99,35,961
6.	PW-15/27, P-14	6988	26.09.2005	22.22 Sq. Yards	30,000	65,34,653
7.	A-15, P-22	5434	27.12.2001	22 Sq. Yards	30,000	66,00,000
8.	PO	3592	20.10.2000	3K-14M	1,10,000	2,37,837
9.	PN	3591	20.10.2000	1K-18M	2,00,000	8,42,105
10.	A-17, P-24	3348	11.11.1999	22.22 Sq. Yards	23,000	50,09,900
11.	PP	3191	17.02.2003	3K-18M	1,40,000	2,87,179
12.	PW-5/2, P-21, P-31, A-14	2322	02.06.2006	100 Sq. Yards	4,90,000	2,37,16,000
13.	PW-5/4, P-15, P-11, A-7	1836	20.05.2005	104 Sq. Yards	2,75,000	1,27,98,076
14.	PH	1678	29.06.2007	200 Sq. Yards	1,000,000	24,200,000
15.	RG, R-8, R-7	15365	31.03.2006	4K	1,95,000	3,90,000
16.	RB, R-2, R-3	4446	02.11.2006	18K-11M	16,24,000	7,00,377
17.	RE, R-5, R-6	200	13.04.2006	4K-17M	4,25,000	7,01,030
JANDALI (Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)						
18.	PW-5/12, P-25	14185	22.03.2006	2K-17M	20,00,000	56,14,035
19.	PW-5/11, P-24	14184	22.03.2006	2K-18M	20,00,000	55,17,241
20.	PW-5/10, P-23	14183	22.03.2006	2K-18M	20,00,000	55,17,241
21.	PW-5/9, P-22	14182	22.03.2006	2K-16M	20,00,000	57,14,285
22.	PW-5/8, P-21	14181	22.03.2006	2K-17M	20,00,000	56,14,035
23.	PW-5/7,P-20	14180	22.03.2006	2K-18M	2000000	55,17,241
24.	PW-5/17, P-19	12739	21.02.2006	13 Sq. Yards	35,000	1,30,30,769
25.	PW-15/18, P-18	12149	06.02.2006	24.44 Sq. Yards	50,000	99,01,800
26.	PW-5/6, P-16, A-9	10602	30.12.2005	133.33 Sq. Yards	4,55,000	32,62,518
27.	PW-5/5, P-13, P-8, A-5	10075	15.02.2005	27 Sq. Yards	1,12,500	2,01,66,666
28.	PW-5/16, P-13	6427	07.09.2005	26.38 Sq. Yards	95,000	1,74,29,871
29.	PW-5/30, P-7	5803	20.09.2004	28 Sq. Yards	50,000	86,42,857
30.	PW-5/29, P-12, P-6, A-4	5649	14.09.2004	13.88 Sq. Yards	25,000	87,17,579
31.	PW-5/14, P-3	4905	16.08.2004	2K-16M	21,00,000	60,00,000

Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos. in various files	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price	Price Per Acre
32.	PW-5/15, P-10,P-2, A-2	3097	18.06.2004	31 Sq. Yards	1,30,000	20296774
33.	P-1	2382	22.07.2003	200 Sq. Yards	80,000	19,36,000
34.	A-13, PW- 5/25, P-20, P-32,	2359	02.06.2006	28.11 Sq. Yards	56,500	97,28,210
35.	PW-5/1, P-9, P-1, A-1	2235	17.07.2003	33.33 Sq. Yards	1,00,000	1,45,21,452
36.	PW-15/24, P-19, P-30, A-12	2159	31.05.2006	36.66 Sq. Yards	74,000	97,69,776
37.	PW-5/23, P-18, P-29, A-11	1559	16.05.2006	295 Sq. Yards	5,31,000	87,12,000
38.	PW-15/22, P-28	1298	10.05.2006	36.66 Sq. Yards	73,500	97,03,764
39.	PW-5/3, P-14, P-10, A-6	738	27.04.2005	80 Sq. Yards	3,05,000	1,84,52,500
40.	PW-15/21, P-27	608	24.04.2006	22.22 Sq. Yards	45,000	98,01,980
41.	PW-15/20, P-17, P-26, A-10	445	20.04.2006	22.66 Sq. Yards	46,000	98,25,242
42.	Additional Evidence (A-1)	14308	23.03.2006	240 Sq. Yards	5,80,000	1,16,96,666
43.	R-5	4518	13.07.2005	203 Sq. Yards	81,500	19,43,152
44.	R-6	2121	26.05.2005	100 Sq. Yards	83,000	40,17,200
SARAI MAHMOODPUR (Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)						
45.	A-20, P-26	2345	02.06.2006	600 Sq. Yards	4,80,000	38,72,000
46.	A-19, P-25	2336	02.06.2006	600 Sq. Yards	4,80,000	38,72,000
47.	P-27	2256	01.06.2006	300 Sq. Yards	2,40,000	38,72,000
48.	R-4	8996	10.01.2005	10K-2M	4,11,000	3,25,544
49.	R-7	5771	17.09.2004	28K	11,37,000	3,24,857
SAUNDA (Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)						
50.	PW-5/19, P-17	11859	30.01.2006	40.33 Sq. Yards	80,000	96,00,793
51.	PW-15/26, P-15, A-8, P-7	10115	20.12.2005	50 Sq. Yards	1,10,000	10,64,8000
52.	PW-15/25, P-12	5307	05.08.2005	46 Sq. Yards	50,000	52,60,869
53.	PW-5/32, P-4	4889	16.08.2004	279 Sq. Yards	4,24,000	73,55,412
54.	PW-5/31, P-8, P-9	695	26.04.2005	50	1,00,000	96,80,000

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos. in various files	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price	Price Per Acre
				Sq. Yards		
55.	RA, R-1	11314	24.03.2005	94.44 Sq. Yards	28,500	14,60,609
56.	R-2, RB	12025	01.02.2006	2K-19M	1,00,000	2,71,186
57.	R-3	12127	06.02.2006	113 Sq. Yards	30,000	12,84,955
AMBALA CITY (Sale Deeds Produced by the landowners)						
58.	PW-5/13, P-11, P-5, A-3	7158	10.11.2004	165.76 Sq. Yards	8,00,000	2,33,59,073
MANDOR (Sale Deeds Produced by the State/Acquiring Agency)						
59.	RA, R-8	1961	19.07.2007	6K-2M	5,70,000	7,47,540

4.7 In order to understand the information compiled in above-noted table, it is appropriate to explain the meaning of the words/phrases used, as under:-

1.	1 Rectangle	=	5 X 5 = 25 Acre
2.	1 Acre	=	160 Marlas
3.	8 Kanal	=	1 Acre
4.	1 Kanal	=	20 Marlas
5.	1 Acre	=	4840 Sq. Yards
6.	1 Marla	=	272.251 Sq. Feet = 30.25 Sq. Yards
7.	1 Inch	=	2.54 cm
8.	1 Foot	=	12 Inch.
9.	1 Sq. Feet	=	12 X 12 =144 Inch.
10.	1 Yard	=	3 Feet
11.	1 Sq. Yard	=	9 Sq. Feet
12.	100 Sq. Yards	=	900 Sq. Feet
13.	1 Kanal	=	0.125 Acre
14.	1 Marla	=	0.00625001 Acre
15.	“/” denotes Rectangle Number.		
16.	“/” denotes Khasra/Killa Number.		
17.	“A” denotes Acre		
18.	“K” denotes Kanal		
19.	“M” denotes Marla		

5. **REASONS AND ANALYSIS OF JUDGMENT DATED
28.10.2016 PASSED BY THE RC IN THE FIRST
ACQUISITION**

5.1 **REASONS**

5.1.1 Now, the stage is set for examining the reasons recorded by the RC while deciding the various reference applications vide judgment dated 28.10.2016. From the careful reading of the award, the following reasons appear to have been recorded:-

- i) The contention of the learned counsel representing the landowners with regard to the grant of 12% cumulative increase on the basis of the judgment passed in the case of *State of Haryana v. Gurdeep Singh and Another* (Ex.PX) cannot be accepted as, in the present case, the acquisition of the land is with respect to four villages, whereas in *Gurdeep Singh's case (supra)*, the acquired land was only from village Saunda.
- (ii) The RC further held that a perusal of the various sale deeds showed variance in the price of the land in the villages. Hence, the sale deeds of one village cannot be taken into consideration for determining the market value of the acquired land in the other villages. The RC distinguished the cases before it from the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Nelson Fernandez and Others v. Special Land Acquisition Officer & Others 2007(1) LACC 535 (Supreme Court)*.
- iii) The RC, thereafter, proceeded to examine the village-

wise sale deeds produced by the landowners. At the first instance, the Court while taking up the cases of village Saunda, noticed that the landowners have produced 2 sale deeds of plots measuring 50 square yards each- Ex.P7(dated 20.12.2005 sold @ 2,200/- per square yard) and Ex.P8(dated 26.04.2006 sold @ 2000/- per square yard). The RC held that the sale deeds, produced by the State, cannot be taken into consideration because it reflects a market value which is less than the market value assessed by the LAC. Thus, the RC proceeded to take the average price of the sale instances (Ex.P7 and Ex.P8) i.e. ₹2,100/- and applied a cut of 50% while recognizing the dissimilarity between the acquired land and the plots covered by the sale exemplars, and finally, arrived at a figure of ₹ 1,050/- per square yard. Thus, the RC assessed the market value of the acquired land on the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act with respect to the acquired land located in village Saunda @ ₹1,050/- per square yard.

- iv) With respect to the acquired land situated in village Jandli, the RC held that the sale instances (Ex.P10, Ex.P11, Ex.P13, Ex.P14 and Ex.P16) relate to the built-up (already constructed) houses and therefore, cannot be relied upon. It was further noticed that the sale instances (Ex.P9, Ex.P12, Ex.P17, Ex.P19 and Ex.P20) are with

respect to the plots of smaller size of land. However, the RC found that the sale instance (Ex.P18) dated 16.05.2006, with respect to the plot measuring 295 square yards, is, although, post the date of the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, however, can be relied upon. Thus, the RC assessed the market value on the basis of the before-mentioned sale instance after applying a cut of 50% on account of dissimilarity between the sale exemplar and the acquired land and finally, determined the market value @ ₹900/- per square yard.

- v) With respect to the acquired land situated in village Kanwali, the RC found that no sale instance of this village has been produced by any of the parties. The RC observed that reliance can be placed upon the sale deeds of the land located in the adjoining village i.e. Kanwla and after ignoring the sale instance Ex.P21 being of a built-up area, Ex.P22 and Ex.P24 being of smaller areas, relied upon the sale instance Ex.P23 dated 14.11.2005 with respect to the plot measuring 208 square yards. The RC applied 50% cut on the value of the plot which was sold for ₹4,27,000/- (the per square yard price comes to ₹2,052.88) and finally, assessed the market value @ ₹1,026/- per square yard.
- vi) In respect of village Sarai Mehdood, the RC relied upon

the sale instances (Ex.P26 and Ex.P27) dated 02.06.2006 (600 square yards) and 01.06.2006 (300 square yards), sold for ₹4,80,000/- and ₹2,80,000/-, respectively. The price comes to ₹800/- per square yard. The RC ignored the sale instance (Ex.RG) dated 17.09.2004, produced by the State, with respect to the land measuring 28 kanals, sold for a total consideration of ₹11,37,500/-, on the ground that the sale price is less than the amount assessed by the LAC and therefore, it is liable to be ignored. The RC further observed that it is much prior to the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act (dated 28.02.2006) and therefore, should be ignored. Thus, the RC after applying 50% cut on account of dissimilarity between the acquired land and the sale sale exemplar relied upon, assessed the market value of the acquired land @ 400/- per square yard.

5.2 ANALYSIS OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED REASONS

5.2.1 As regards the first reason assigned by the RC in the first acquisition, it would be noted that it has correctly refused to rely upon the judgment in ***Gurdeep Singh's case*** (*supra*), which is marked as Ex.PX. It is with respect to the acquisition of the land in village Saunda vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 06.07.2000. This acquisition was made for the construction of water works based, on the canal water. The aforesaid acquisition is approximately six years prior to the present acquisition and there is no evidence to show how the geographical location

of the land acquired in the afore-said notification is comparable to the land acquired in the present case, for determining the market value.

5.2.2 The next reason assigned by the RC is to the effect that the sale deed of the parcel of land located in one village cannot be taken into consideration for determining the market value of the acquired land in the other village because there is a huge variation in the price. It is noted here that the aforesaid reasoning is not wholly correct, however, it shall be elaborately discussed in the later part of the judgment. Thereafter, the RC proceeded to rely upon the sale instances (Ex.P7 and Ex.P8) with respect to the plots, each measuring 50 square yards, located in village Saunda to determine the market value of the acquired land. It is noted here that in the village Saunda itself, the total acquisition is of 16.808 acres. Normally, each acre consists of 4840 square yards area. There is no evidence to the effect that the land acquired was already a developed land. In such circumstances, the RC has erred in relying upon the sale instance of developed plots measuring 50 square yards to determine the market value of the undeveloped agricultural land. Similarly, the RC has also erred by observing that the sale instance (Ex.RA) dated 24.03.2005, produced by the State, with respect to the plot measuring 94.44 square yards, cannot be relied upon because the price is less than the amount assessed by the LAC. It is evident that while determining the market value, the RC is required to take into consideration the entire evidence produced. Section 25 of the 1894 Act only prohibits the RC from assessing the market value at an amount lesser than the amount assessed by the LAC. However, there is no bar in taking into consideration the sale instances depicting a price lesser than the amount assessed by the

LAC. A reference, in this regard, can be placed upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Lal Chand v. Union of India and Others (2009) 15 SCC 769*.

5.2.3 The next reason assigned by the RC, while determining the market value of the acquired land of village Jandli, to say the least, is strange. The RC, after noticing that the sale instance (Ex.P18) is post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, still chooses to rely upon the same. The sale instance Ex.P18- (which is only with respect to 295 square yards plot) is dated 16.05.2006, whereas, the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act with respect to the first acquisition was issued on 28.02.2006. Similarly, with respect to the acquired land located in village Kanwli, the RC noticed that no sale instance of village Kanwli has been produced. However, the RC has relied upon the sale instance of a parcel of land located in the village Kanwla and held that Ex.P23 dated 14.11.2005 with respect to the plot measuring 208 square yards is an appropriate sale exemplar and considering the smaller size of the plot represented by Ex.P23, the RC applied a cut @ 50% on it. In the considered opinion of the Court, in the presence of relevant evidence produced by the State, the RC committed an error in overlooking the same. With respect to the acquired land situated in village Sarai Mehdood, the RC has relied upon Ex.P26, the sale instance dated 02.06.2006 (plot measuring 600 square yards) and Ex.P27, the sale instance dated 01.06.2006 (plot measuring 300 square yards), respectively. The RC ignored the sale instance (Ex.RG) dated 17.09.2004, produced by the State, with respect to 28 kanals of plot sold for ₹11,37,500/- on the ground that the sale price is lesser than the amount determined by the LAC.

For the similar reasons, as already noticed, the sale instance (Ex.RG), with respect to the agricultural land measuring 28 kanals, was a comparable sale instance and it has been wrongly ignored by the RC.

**6. REASONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE JUDGMENT
DATED 09.11.2016 PASSED BY THE RC IN THE
SECOND ACQUISITION**

6.1 REASONS

6.1.1 In the second acquisition, which was initiated with the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 20.07.2006, the RC has decided the cases in different batches. The first award was passed on 09.11.2006 while deciding 362 reference petitions. On 25.03.2019, another batch of 32 reference petitions was decided. On 16.04.2021, a batch of 24 reference petitions was disposed of.

6.1.2 It is noted here that the same Presiding Judge, who decided the cases from the 1st acquisition vide award dated 28.10.2016 has decided the cases arising from the 2nd acquisition vide award dated 09.11.2006. The reasons assigned in both the judgments are identical. In fact, the reason No.1 and 2 are exactly same and need no further elaboration. Thereafter, the Court proceeded to assess the market value of the acquired land village-wise, after taking a note of the fact that there is a vast variation in the price of the land. The RC has held that the sale deeds (Ex.A2, Ex.A5, Ex.A6 and Ex.A9) of village Jandali are either with respect to built-up shops or houses and therefore, are liable to be ignored, whereas, the sale instances Ex.A1 (33.33 square yards), Ex.A4 (13.88 square yards), Ex.A10 (22.66 square yards), Ex.A12 (36.66 square yards) and Ex.A13 (28.11 square yards) are liable to be ignored because these are with respect to plots of smaller sizes.

However, the RC relied upon the sale instance of plot measuring 295 Square yards (Ex.A11) dated 16.05.2006 sold for a total consideration of ₹5,31,000/-. The market value comes to ₹1,800/- per square yard. The RC while holding that this plot is of a small size, accordingly, applied a cut of 50% on account of dissimilarity between the acquired land and size of the plot and finally arrived at a market value of the acquired land @ ₹900/- per square yard. In respect of the acquired land of village Kanwla, the RC noticed that the landowners have produced the sale instances (Ex.A7, Ex.A14, Ex.A15, Ex.A16, Ex.A17 and Ex.PH) and the price per square yard is ranging from ₹1,035/- per square yard to ₹5,000/- per square yard. It was also noticed that the State has also produced the sale deeds Ex.RA(dated 19.07.2007) and Ex.R13 (dated 02.11.2006), which are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Ex.RE dated 13.04.2006 is with respect to the land measuring 4 kanals and 17 marlas sold for a total consideration of ₹4,25,000/-. The rate per square yard of the land comes to ₹144.84. Similarly, the State has also produced the sale instance (Ex.RG) dated 31.03.2006 with respect to the land measuring 4 kanals sold for a total consideration of ₹1,10,000/- and the rate per square yard works out to ₹45.45. Thereafter, the RC ignored the sale instances (Ex.RE and Ex.RG) on the premise that the market price of the sale deeds is less than the amount assessed and offered by the LAC. Thereafter, the RC has opted to rely upon the sale instance Ex.A16 (dated 14.11.2005) with respect to the plot measuring 208 square yards sold for a sold for a total consideration of ₹4,27,000/-. The per square yard price comes to ₹2,052.88/-. After applying a deduction cut of 50%, keeping in view the dissimilarity of the plot of land

vis-a-vis the acquired land, the RC, finally, worked out the price @ ₹1,026/- per square yard.

6.1.3 With respect to the acquired land, situated in village Sarai Mehdood, the RC has noticed that the two sale instances (Ex.A19 and Ex.A20), each is with respect to a plot measuring 600 square yards, which have been sold for a total consideration of ₹4,80,000/- individually, have been produced. The per acre price comes to ₹800/-. The RC held that no sale deed has been produced by the State with respect to the land situated in village Sarai Mehdood and therefore, after applying a deduction cut @ 50%, it, finally, held that the landowners are entitled to ₹400/- per square yard.

6.1.4 With respect to the acquired land, located in village Kanwli, the RC noticed that the landowners have produced the sale instance (Ex.A18) dated 01.05.2006 for the land measuring 371 square yards sold for a total consideration ₹2,97,000/-. The per square yard price comes to ₹800/-, whereas, the State has produced three sale instances i.e. Ex.RC dated 04.07.2005, with respect to the land measuring 4 kanals, Ex.RD dated 03.07.2006, with respect to the land measuring 78 Kanals & 14 Marlas, Ex.R6 dated 16.05.2005, with respect to the land measuring 5 Kanals & 7 Marlas. The RC held that since the sale price, in the sale deeds, produced by the State of Haryana, is lesser than the amount assessed by the LAC, therefore, they cannot be relied upon in view of the bar under Section 25 of the 1894 Act. Thereafter, the RC proceeded to rely upon the assessment made with respect to the acquired land situated in village Kanwli in respect of the first acquisition and held that the landowners are entitled to the market value @ ₹1,026/- per square yard.

6.2 ANALYSIS OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED REASONS

6.2.1 Now the stage is set for analyzing the reasons given by the RC while deciding the second acquisition. As regards the reason No. (i) and (ii), the same are common and therefore, have already been discussed. As regards the decision to make the assessment of the market value of acquired land village-wise, the same shall be discussed in the later part of the judgment. However, at this stage, it is relevant to note the reasons given by the RC to prefer the sale deeds. While assessing the evidence of village Jandli, the RC has relied upon Ex.A11, which is the sale instance dated 16.05.2006 with respect to a plot measuring 295 square yards sold for a total consideration of ₹5,31,000/-. Normally, a plot measuring 295 square yards, cannot be used for agricultural purposes. When the RC is assessing the compensation for more than 330 acres of the land, it is not appropriate for the Court to assess the compensation on the basis of a plot measuring 295 square yards only, particularly when the comparable sale instances of reasonably sized parcels of land with respect to the acquired land are available. In fact, the plot measuring 295 square yards is less than 1/16th part of an acre of land. An acre of land normally consists of the area measuring 4840 square yards and the plot measuring 295 square yards is merely 6% of an acre of land.

6.2.2 Similarly, while discussing the evidence for the acquisition of the land situated in village Kanwla, the RC relied upon the sale instance (Ex.A16) dated 14.11.2005 with respect to the plot measuring 208 square yards sold for a total consideration of ₹4,27,000/-. The per square yard price comes to ₹2,05.88/-. Again, the reliance was placed on a plot measuring 208 square yards to assess the market value of the land measuring more than 330

square yards is clearly erroneous. As regards the assessment of the land situated in village Sarai Mehdood, the RC again relied upon the same sale instance as was relied upon while deciding the first acquisition.

6.2.3 At this stage, it is appropriate to note Section 25 of the 1894 Act, which is reproduced hereunder:-

“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”.

6.2.4 It is evident from the careful reading of the aforesaid provision that the statute has prohibited the RC from assessing the market value of the acquired land at a price which is lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. However, there is no bar in taking into consideration the sale deeds of a lesser value. The issue regarding this is no longer *res-integra*. In ***Lal Chand Vs. Union of India and another (2009) 15 SCC 769***, the Hon’ble Supreme Court, after discussing the relevant case laws, has expounded as under:-

“55. We fail to see how the said section has any relevance in regard to determination of market value as contrasted from award of compensation. If the sale deeds relied on by the respondents showed a particular market value, they cannot be ignored merely because the Collector had awarded compensation at a higher rate in regard to the acquired land.

56. *All that Section 25 requires is that courts should not award an amount which is less than what is awarded by the LAC, even if the evidence may show a lesser market value. So, the bar under Section 25 of the LA Act is not in regard to determination of a market value, which is less than what was awarded by the LAO. The bar is only upon the RC (or any higher court) reducing the compensation awarded by the LAC”.*

6.2.5 Therefore, the reasons for ignoring the sale instances produced by the State of Haryana are clearly erroneous. This also sufficiently answers Issue No.1.

6.2.6 As already noticed, in the second acquisition, the RC has decided the cases in three different batches. Let us first examine the evidence produced by the landowners in LAC No. 599 of 2017 and other connected cases, which came to be decided on 25.03.2019. The landowners have examined PW.1 Chander Kala, PW.2 Karamjit Singh, PW.3 Anil Kumar, PW.4 Ranjit Kaur, PW.5 Ashok Kumar and PW.6 Tara Devi. They have also tendered the previous award passed by the RC on 09.11.2016 as Ex.PX. On the other hand, Samat Singh, Patwari, appeared before the RC and submitted that these matters can be decided in terms of the judgment (Ex.PX). The RC, after relying upon the previous judgment passed on 09.11.2016, assessed similar compensation in these cases. There is yet another award passed by the RC while deciding as many as 24 reference petitions on 16.04.2021. In this case, Baljit Singh, one of the landowners, appeared as PW.1 and tendered his affidavit. He also relied upon the

judgment dated 09.11.2016. The RC, after noticing that the matter has already been decided, has relied upon the same and passed the order, accordingly.

**7. ARGUMENTS ADDRESSED BY THE LEARNED
COUNSELS BEFORE THIS COURT**

7.1 Heard learned counsel representing the parties and with their able assistance, perused the various awards passed by the RC along with the record, which was requisitioned. A few learned counsels have also filed their written arguments.

7.2 Mr. Jasmer Chand, Advocate, while taking the lead amongst the various counsels appearing for the landowners, has drawn the attention of the Court to Ex.P2, a brochure issued in the year 1999 while inviting the applications for the allotment of the residential plots in Sector 10, Ambala and has gone to submit that Ambala is recognized as a prestigious and most sought after urban area in the Northern India as it is easily accessible and offers a pollutant free environment. He contends that way back in the year 1991 itself, Ambala had emerged as a prestigious and most sought after urban area in the Northern India. He, hence, contends that the assessment made by the RC is on the lower side. He, while referring to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashrafi and Others v. State of Haryana and Others (2013) 5 SCC 527* (Ex.PK) has contended that the RC has committed an error in assessing the market value on the basis of the sale deeds, particularly when there are previous judgments assessing the market value of the land in the village and therefore, the Court should have worked out the market value as existed on the date of notification under Section 4 of

the 1894 Act i.e. 28.02.2006 by granting 12% per annum escalation, cumulatively, over and above the market value assessed by the Supreme Court or the High Court with respect to the previous acquisitions in the area. The learned counsel, while referring to para 41 and 42 of the judgment in *Ashrafi's case (supra)*, has submitted that a judicial declaration is the best way forward and therefore, the Court must grant an increase @ 12% annually and cumulatively, from the date of the judgment passed in *Surinder Kumar v. State of Haryana (Special Leave Petition(C) Nos. 16372-16040 of 2008*, which was later on, modified in *Ashrafi's case (supra)*. It is noted here that in *Surinder Kumar's case (supra)*, the land of village Patti Mahar, Saunda and Jandli acquired vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 26.05.1981 was assessed @ ₹110/- per square yard which was subsequently, modified by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The learned counsel contends that the present acquisition is also with respect to land located in villages Saunda and Jandli and therefore, the Court is bound to assess the market value by increasing the amount @ 12% per year cumulatively. While referring to the order passed by the High Court at the time of remand, he claims that the RC has failed to comply with the same. He, while referring to the judgment passed on 05.08.2015 in *Gurpreet Singh Vs. State of Haryana*, contends that in the said case, the market value of the land acquired in village Saunda, for the construction of a canal water based water works, has been assessed, the said acquisition is of the year 2000 and therefore, the Court should grant an increase of 12% per year cumulatively on the amount assessed in the aforesaid judgment so as to assess the market value of the acquired land in the present case. In support

thereof, he relies upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kashmir Singh v. State of Haryana (2014) 2 SCC 165.***

7.3 Mr. M.L.Sharma, Advocate, appearing for certain other landowners, has contended that the entire area was already a residential area as is depicted in the layout plan Ex.P23 and hence, the Court should have taken the average of all the sale deeds produced by the landowners. He, further, contends that the RC, also, erred in applying a cut of 50%, although it should not have been more than 20%. He relies upon the judgment passed in ***Atma Singh (Dead) through LRs. and Others v. State of Haryana (2008) 2 SCC 568*** and ***Meharawal Khewaji Trust v. State of Punjab (2012) 5 SCC 432.*** He, further, contends that all the relevant sale transactions have been produced by the landowners and the documents produced by the respondent-State are irrelevant and therefore, should not be considered. The court should focus only on the annual cumulative increase to work out the market value of the acquired land.

7.4 Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate, appearing for the certain other landowners, has contended that in another judgment, for the purpose of developing the land in Sector 10, the acquisition was made from the same rectangle and therefore, the Court should have granted cumulative increase @ 12% per annum. He, in support thereof, relies on the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***The General Manager, Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited v. Rameshbhai Jivanbhai Patel & Anr. (2008)14 SCC 745.*** Various other counsels have adopted the arguments of Learned counsels as noted above.

7.5 Per contra, the learned counsel representing the State has

submitted that there is no evidence of increase in the market value of the land in the area. While referring to the various documents, he has submitted that the market value of the acquired land keeps fluctuating due to various reasons and once the comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period have been produced, the RC should not indulge in assumptions that the price of the land would increase @ 12% cumulatively every year. He has further submitted that the State Government or the HUDA has not allotted any part of the acquired land to Vatika Developers. He has further contended that the landowners have withheld the sale deeds of bigger parcels of the land and therefore, the Court should allow the appeal of the State of Haryana.

8. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS BY THIS COURT

8.1 HISTORY OF ACQUISITION

8.1.1 Let us, first, proceed to understand the history of acquisition in the area. As per the record, the process of acquisition first began by issuing a notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 30.01.1973 to acquire some land of the village Patti Mahar for developing a colony by the HUDA. The Division Bench of the High Court in *Om Parkash v. State of Haryana (Letters Patent Appeal No. 1340 of 1982)* held that the market value of the acquired land in village Patti Mahar in the year 1973 was ₹70/- per square yard. Thereafter, there was another acquisition in village Saunda in the year 1981. The matter with regard to the assessment of the market value came to be finally decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashrafi's case (supra)*, while deciding a large number of appeals, arising from the States of Punjab, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Union Territory of

Chandigarh. There was another acquisition of the land in village Saunda by issuing notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 06.07.2000 for developing canal water based water works which ultimately resulted assessing the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 895/- per square yard by the High Court in *State of Haryana v. Gurpreet Singh (Regular First Appeal No. 5650 of 2009, decided on 05.08.2015)*. There was yet another acquisition, which was initiated by issuing notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 31.03.1997 for the construction of water works (other water works) and the High Court assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹ 170/- per square yard in *Prem Singh and Others v. State of Haryana*. Similarly, for carving out a colony i.e. Sector 10, the acquisition was initiated by issuing a notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 02.02.1989. In *Manohar Lal Khurana v. State of Haryana (Letters Patent Appeal No. 292 of 1999, decided on 22.02.2006)*, the market value of the land of the villages, namely Saunda and Jandli was assessed @ ₹8,95,000/- per acre. However, all these acquisitions referred to above, as already noticed, are on the Northern side of the acquired land. In fact, the acquired land is situated on a corner as it has no direct connectivity either with the Railway Station or the Bus Stand at Ambala Cantonment. The High Court, while remanding back the case, has already observed that the layout plan, produced by the landowners, is misleading. No doubt, after the remand, fresh layout plans have been produced. However, even now, the distance by road between the Railway Station or the Bus Stand at Ambala, on the one side and the acquired land, on the other side, has not been disclosed.

8.2 DETERMINATION OF ISSUE NO.I

8.2.1 This issue has been elaborately dealt with in para 6.2.6 of this judgment. Succinctly, the RC, while passing the impugned judgments, has committed a manifest error in overlooking the sale instances produced by the State of Haryana. These sale instances have been ignored by the various RCs, in the respective petitions, on the premise that the sale price reflected in the sale deeds is less than the amount assessed by the LAC and therefore, by virtue of Section 25 of the 1894 Act, such sale instances cannot be relied upon. The various Reference Courts, while deciding the respective cases, have overlooked the well settled law in this regard. It is evident that under Section 25 of the 1894 Act, the RC should not award an amount which is lesser than the amount assessed by the LAC. However, there is no prohibition or restriction to take into consideration the sale exemplars, produced by any of the parties, which depict a price lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. Reliance, in this regard, can be placed on the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Lal Chand's case (supra)*.

8.2.2 Therefore, it is observed that the RCs have erred in ignoring the sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana. Thus, issue No.I has been sufficiently answered.

8.3 DETERMINATION OF ISSUE NO.II(a)

8.3.1 It is apparent that the RC has proceeded to assess the market value of the acquired land on a wholly wrong basis. While assessing the market value of the acquired land in village Saunda, the RC relied upon two sale deeds (Ex.P7 and Ex.P8), which are with respect to very small sized plots measuring 50 square yards each, whereas, the sale deed (Ex.RB) dated

01.02.2006, produced by the State, is with respect to the land measuring 2 Kanals and 19 Marlas, which was sold for ₹1,00,000/-. The per acre price comes to ₹2,71,000/-. This parcel of the land, which is of a reasonable size, is not far away from the acquired land in village Saunda. This parcel of land has been acquired for the purpose of developing Sector 23. Similarly, while assessing the market value of the acquired land in village Jandli, the RC has relied upon the sale instance dated 16.05.2006 (Ex.P18) with respect to the plot measuring 295 square yards. It is with respect to a developed plot and cannot be made the basis to assess the market value of a large track of undeveloped land. Similarly, while assessing the market value of the acquired land in village Kanwali, the RC has relied upon the sale instance (Ex.P23) dated 14.11.2005, with respect to a plot measuring 208 square yards. The price per square yard comes to ₹2,052.88/-. This plot is again a part of the developed colony and could not be relied upon to assess the market value of a huge track of agricultural land. Similarly, for assessing the market value of the land in village Sarai Mehdood, the RC has relied upon the sale instances (Ex.P26 dated 02.06.2006 and Ex.P27 dated 01.06.2006) with respect to the developed plots measuring 600 and 300 square yards, respectively. The RC, after observing that Ex.RG/R7 is a sale deed dated 17.09.2004 of village Sarai Mehdood, with respect to the land measuring 28 Kanals, which was sold for ₹11,37,500/-, committed an error in ignoring the same on the premise that the sale price is lesser than the amount assessed by the LAC.

8.3.2 Even while assessing the market value of the acquired land with respect to the second acquisition, the RC has committed similar errors. In

fact, in the second acquisition also, the judgment has been delivered by the same Presiding Judge, by whom it was delivered in the first acquisition. With respect to village Jandli, the RC has relied upon the sale instance (Ex.A11) with respect to a plot measuring 295 square yards. In village Kanwla, the RC has relied upon the sale instance (ExA16) with respect to a plot measuring 208 square yards. While assessing the market value of the acquired land of village Kanwli, the RC has relied upon the previous award arising from the first acquisition.

8.3.3 From a bare look at the various layout plans produced by the respective parties, it is evident that the acquired land of Sector 22 and 23 abut each other. In fact, the acquired land of Sector 23 is in bits and pieces along with the land of private developers and is located in different parcels which are not contiguous. It can be said that the acquired land of Sector 23 is in various parcels having minimal connectivity with each other. Although, the litigation with reference to the private developers is pending, however, this is not a relevant fact for the purpose of decision in the present case.

8.3.4 Further, it is also observed here that after the remand of the case, the landowners have produced a fresh layout plan Ex.PW.8/D. In the aforesaid layout plan, the location of as many as 29 sale exemplars has been disclosed. It is evident, on careful perusal of the layout plan, that all the other sale deeds are with respect to the developed areas and none of the sale deeds are with respect to the acquired land or the nearby land. It is also evident that the sale deeds dated 16.08.2004 and 12.03.2006 are with respect to the area which is towards the Eastern side of the Railway Line, whereas the acquired land is located on the Western side of the Railway Line. After

the Railway line there is a big strip of land reserved for the defence forces and thereafter, lies the acquired land. It is further evident that all those sale deeds produced by the landowners are either of the residential colonies or the market area. Hence, the aforesaid sale deeds exemplars cannot be relied upon.

8.3.5 There is another layout plan which has not been exhibited by the Court. In the aforesaid layout plan, with respect to Sector 23, HUDA, the position of the various parcels of the land sold through various sale exemplars produced by the landowners is no different. The sale exemplars produced by the landowners are with respect to the already developed sectors/areas/market, hence, these sale exemplars are not the comparable sale deeds. As such, these sale deeds cannot be relied upon.

8.3.6 Moreover, there is another important aspect of the matter which is required to be noticed. In the second acquisition, which was initiated on 20.07.2006, the State of Haryana has produced the various sale instances of village Kanwala and Kanwali (Ex.RG/R8 dated 31.03.2006, Ex.RB/R2 dated 02.11.2006, Ex.RC/R3 dated 04.07.2005, Ex.RD/R4 dated 03.07.2006 and Ex.RF/R7 dated 16.05.2005). From a bare perusal of lay out plan-Ex.R9 produced by the State of Haryana, it is evident that these sale instances are related to various parcels of the land, located in villages Kanwala and Kanwali, with respect to the acquired land. It is also evident that the acquired land itself has been purchased at a price less than ₹8,00,000/- per acre. The RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land in these villages @ ₹49,65,840/- per acre, whereas, the sale instance dated 31.03.2006 (Ex.RG/R8), which is with respect to the period just about four

months prior to the date of notification, under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, in the second acquisition. The land has been sold @ ₹220/- per square yard. Ex.RB/R2 is a sale instance dated 02.11.2006, which is executed within four months post the date of notification, under Section 4 of the 1894 Act and the land has been sold @ ₹7,47,541/- per acre. Similar is the position with regard to the sale instance Ex.RC/R3 dated 04.07.2005, which is one month prior to the date of notification, under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The sale instances of villages, namely Kanwala and Kanwali (Ex.RD/R4 dated 03.07.2006, Ex.RF/R7 dated 16.05.2005 and Ex.RE/R5 dated 13.04.2006) consistently reflect that the price of the acquired land is not beyond ₹8,00,000/- per acre as had been awarded by the LAC. Thus, an inescapable conclusion is that the RC has committed an error in assessing the market value.

8.3.7 There is yet another aspect of the case. It may be noted here there is no physical boundary between the two villages. Such boundary between the villages is only fictional so as to identify that a particular parcel of the land is located in the territorial limits of a particular village. In both the acquisitions, a compact block of land from four contiguous villages has been acquired. In other words, although, the acquired land is located in different villages, however, there does not appear to be much difference in the geographical location or topography of the land in all these villages as they lie adjoining to each other. There is no evidence to establish that the market value of the acquired land located in various contiguous villages was significantly different because of its locational advantage. The RC has committed an error in forming its opinion on the basis of the sale exemplars

of very small pieces of developed land which are dissimilar to the acquired land. While assessing the market value of such compact block of land, the court is required to be conscious of its geographical location and the locational advantage, if any, of any individual parcel of land located in a particular village.

8.3.8 It is significant to note that the landowners have, no doubt, produced various layout plans, however, the same are required to be examined in view of the observations made in the previous order of the High Court while remanding the matter. Merely because a sale exemplar with respect to a parcel of land located in a particular village has been produced that in itself is not sufficient to prove the market value of the acquired land. Once there is undeveloped land is located near the city, there are chances of huge price variation depending upon the location of a particular parcel or plot.

8.4 **DETERMINATION ON ISSUE NO.II (b)**

8.4.1 Mr. Jasmer Chand, Advocate, the lead counsel, has heavily relied upon the judgment passed in *Ashrafi's case (supra)* to contend that the Supreme Court has laid down that once the price of the acquired land in the village has been determined, then, in the subsequent acquisitions, the Courts are bound to assess the market value after granting 12% cumulative increase per year on the market value assessed by the Supreme Court. This Bench has very sincerely read the judgment passed in *Ashrafi's case (supra)*. It is evident that in the aforesaid judgment, itself, the Supreme Court has determined the market value of the acquired land located in the States of Punjab, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Union Territory of

Chandigarh. There were two sets of appeal arising from the District Ambala. The first appeal was with respect to the acquisition of the land in the villages, namely Patti Mahar, Saunda and Jandali acquired vide notification dated 26.05.1981. In the absence of any other evidence, the Court approved 12% cumulative increase in the facts of that case. However, in the considered opinion of the Court, it cannot be concluded that the Supreme Court has laid down that in all the subsequent acquisitions in the area, the market value of the acquired land is required to be cumulatively increased @ 12% per annum. It is noted here that while assessing the market value of the acquired land, the Court is required to make an assessment on the basis of the evidence produced. Hence, the Court assesses the market value after evaluating the evidence on the basis of the rationale or the conclusion drawn by the Presiding Judge. If proper evidence is not produced, the assessment is likely to reflect a different market value. Moreover, the Court, while assessing the market value, does not grant a declaration that the market value of a particular parcel of the acquired land is the exact amount assessed therein. There is also no element of declaration that the assessed amount is the market value of the land in a particular village or town or area. Furthermore, it is not always safe to outrightly rely upon a previous assessment made by the Court in a different acquisition proceeding. The market value of the land is subject to fluctuations. Moreover, the market value of the land never increases in a straight-line. Ordinarily, the increase in the market value of the acquired land is not constant. Such increase is based upon various factors. In the present case, for the acquisition of the land with respect to the first acquisition, the notification under Section 4 of the 1894

Act was issued on 28.02.2006, thereafter, it is evident from the perusal of the sale instances (Ex.R8, Ex.R2, Ex.R3 and Ex.R5), produced by the State in the second acquisition, that the price of the land did not increase much. The acquired land is located in one corner having no direct connectivity with the main city i.e. Ambala Cantonment. The acquired land does not have direct connectivity with the Railway Station or the Bus Stand. On the Eastern side of the land, there is a big parcel of land reserved for defence. Adjacent to it, there is a Railway line. On the Western side, there is village Materi Jattan. The already developed sectors 8, 9 and 10 are at a distance. It is to be noted here that the City of Ambala is in two parts. The Railway Station and the Bus Stand are in Ambala Cantonment, which is located towards the Eastern side of the Railway line. The Bus Stand is located on the Eastern side of Grand Trunk Road, which is a National Highway, whereas, the acquired land is towards the Western side of the railway line. On that side, neither the Railway Station has an opening nor the acquired land has any direct connectivity with the Bus Stand. This appears to be the reason as to why the prices of the land have not increased significantly, particularly when the acquisition in the area started way back in the year 1973 and the land in question is located near to the city.

8.4.2 Hence, the judgment passed in *Ashrafi's case (supra)*, with greatest respect, cannot be read in the manner suggested by the learned counsel. The Hon'ble Supreme Court after discussing the relevant case laws on the subject, in *Manoj Kumar etc. Vs. State of Haryana and Others (2018) 13 SCC 96*, has held as under:-

“14. In our opinion, the High Court could not have placed an

outright reliance on the decision of Swaran Singh's case, without considering the nature of transaction relied upon in the said decision. The decision could not have been applied ipso facto to the facts of the instant case. In such cases, where such judgments/awards are relied on as evidence, though they are relevant, but cannot be said to be binding with respect to the determination of the price, that has to depend on the evidence adduced in the case. However, in the instant case, it appears that the land in Swaran Singh's case was situated just across the road as observed by the High Court as such it is relevant evidence but not binding. As such it could have been taken into consideration due to the nearness of the area, but at the same time what was the nature of the transaction relied upon in the said case was also required to be looked into in an objective manner. Such decisions in other cases cannot be adopted without examining the basis for determining compensation whether sale transaction referred to therein can be relied upon or not and what was the distance, size and also bonafide nature of transaction before such judgments/awards are relied on for deciding the subsequent cases. It is not open to accepting determination in a mechanical manner without considering the merit. Such determination cannot be said to be binding. We have come across several decisions where the High Court is adopting the previous decisions as binding. The determination of compensation in each case depends upon the nature of land

and what is the evidence adduced in each case, may be that better evidence has been adduced in later case regarding the actual value of property and subsequent sale deeds after the award and before preliminary notification under Section 4 are also to be considered, if filed. It is not proper to ignore the evidence adduced in the case at hand. The compensation cannot be determined by blindly following the previous award/judgment. It has to be considered only a piece of evidence not beyond that. Court has to apply the judicial mind and is supposed not to follow the previous awards without due consideration of the facts and circumstances and evidence adduced in the case in question. The current value reflected by comparable sale deeds is more reliable and binding for determination of compensation in such cases award/judgment relating to an acquisition made before 5 to 10 years cannot form the safe basis for determining compensation”.

8.4.3 Mr. Jasmer Chand, Advocate, has further, firmly, relied upon the observation made by the High Court while remanding back the matter. It is noted here that while remanding the case, the Court has set aside the judgment of the RC and called upon the Courts to re-decide the matter after permitting the parties to lead their respective evidence. Hence, one sentence in the order of remand cannot be read, in exclusion to the complete context, in the manner suggested by the learned counsel. On a careful reading of the order of remand in the 1st round, this bench does not find that the RC has committed any infringement of the order remanding the cases.

8.4.4 The next argument of the learned counsel representing the appellants is on the basis of the judgment passed by the High Court in *Gurdeep Singh's case (supra)*, while deciding the market value of the acquired land in the year 2000 for the construction of the water works. For the similar reasons, as noticed while examining the judgment in *Ashrafi's case (supra)*, the argument is found to be without substance and hence, rejected.

8.4.5 The next argument of the learned counsel representing the landowners is to the effect that the entire area is a residential area, therefore, the average of all the relevant sale instances produced by the landowners should be taken to assess the market value. As already noticed, the landowners have produced the sale exemplars of very small parcels of the developed land. Most of the plots are either for the construction of the shops or the residential houses. Therefore, there is a significant dissimilarity between the nature of the acquired land and the various parcels of land covered by the sale instances relied upon by the landowners. Hence, it is not considered safe to rely upon their average.

8.4.6 Along with the written arguments, Mr.M.L.Sharma, Advocate, has relied upon the various judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in order to support his arguments. The first judgment is in *Mehrawal Khewajilal Trust (Regd.), Faridkot v. State of Punjab (2012) 5 SCC 432*. In this case, the Supreme Court was assessing the market value of 259 Kanals and 16 Marlas of the acquired land for the extension of the existing Grain Market at Faridkot. After noticing that the RC has averaged the prices of all the three sale exemplars, the Court considered it appropriate to re-examine

the matter and held that averaging was not appropriate in the facts of that case. The Court further held that the landowners are entitled to rely upon the sale exemplar depicting highest price and the deduction @ 20% in the facts of the case would be most appropriate. It is noted here that the Supreme Court has clearly held that the sale exemplar should be of a comparable parcel of land of the contemporaneous period. In the present case, none of the sale exemplars produced by the landowners are found comparable whereas the sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana are not only comparable but also executed during the contemporaneous period. Therefore, even if the sale exemplar of highest price is taken into consideration, the market value assessed by the LAC appears to be correct. The second judgment relied upon is in *Trishala Jain and Others v. State of Uttaranchal and Others (2011) 6 SCC 47*. In this case, the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 30.01.1992 was issued for the construction of the Public Polytechnic Institute in District Dehradun. The Court, after framing the issues involved and noticing that there are a number of sale deeds between the family members and a clear attempt on the part of the claimant has been made to execute the sale deeds for the purpose of hiking up the land price, ultimately went on to hold that while assessing the market value, some amount of guess work is required to be carried by the Court.

8.4.7 The next judgment relied upon by the learned counsel is in *Atma Singh (Dead) through LRs. And others v. State of Haryana and Others (2008)2 SCC 568*. In this judgment, the acquisition was made for the construction of a Sugar Mill. In the facts of the case, the Court held that

development cut @ 10% would be more appropriate. The next judgment relied upon by the learned counsel representing the appellants is in *Bhagwathula Samana and Others v. Special Tehsildar and Land Acquisition Officer, Vishakhapatnam Municipality, Vishakhapatnam (1991) 4 SCC506*. In this case, the Court was examining the two acquisitions for the construction of quarters for the staff of the Port Trust and National Highway Diversion Road. The Court, ultimately, held that the High Court erred in applying a deduction. The learned counsel has further relied upon the judgment passed in *Manoj Kumar's case (supra)*. In this case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down that the awards and the judgments in independent cases, not being inter parties, are not binding precedents. The Court further went on to hold that in the absence of evidence with regard to similar nature of land or comparable geographical location with the acquired land, the Courts would be doing more injustice while relying upon such precedents. The Court further held that reliance on a previous judgment given between different parties cannot be relied upon, blankly, without examining the facts of the case. While modifying the judgment of the High Court, the Supreme Court made certain strong observations, which have already been extracted.

8.4.8 It may be noted here that the learned counsel for the land owners has also relied upon the judgment in *Kashmir Singh's (Supra)*. From a careful reading thereof, it is evident that in the facts of the aforesaid case, the court worked out the market value by escalating the amount assessed in the previous assessment of the Court in the Tohana area @ 12% cumulatively per year. However, the same rule cannot be applied universally

in all the acquisitions. After a careful reading of the judgment passed in *Nelson Fernandez's (Supra)*, it is to be noted that the court was assessing the market value of the acquired land for Konkan Railways. The D.B. of the High Court reduced the market value, however, the Supreme Court, after re-evaluating the evidence on record, enhanced the same.

8.4.9 Thus, undisputedly, as a proposition of law, the Supreme Court did not lay down that the Court, while assessing the market value, must follow the previous assessment made by the Court. It was rather held that when in the absence of the evidence of the comparable sale exemplars of contemporaneous period, such assessment of the market value can be relied upon examining the facts of the case. Therefore, in the considered opinion of this Bench, while assessing the market value of the acquired land, the comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period should be preferred. If the sale exemplar of the acquired land itself is available, then, the Court can safely rely upon the same to the exclusion of the other evidence. The ultimate goal of the Court is to assess the market value on the date of the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The Court is required to assess the market value on which a willing purchaser is ready to buy from a willing seller. The market value is dependent on the various factors including potential of the geographical location of the acquired land. The purpose of acquisition and price in the surrounding areas are also relevant factors. There can be innumerable other factors which affect the market value of a particular parcel of the land. The quest of the Court must always be to assess the correct market value on the basis of the material available on record. The methods like per year increase and reliance on a

previous judgment passed by the Court should be opted as a measure of last resort, only, as they open the doors for guess work, which the Courts should try to avoid. Therefore, it is only when no other evidence is available, the Court can rely upon the previous decisions to assess the market value of the acquired land.

8.5 In Regular First Appeal No. 2134 of 2021, an appeal arising from the second acquisition, the appellant has filed an application for permission to lead additional evidence. Although, the aforesaid appeal is being separately decided, however, in order to assess the correct market value of the acquired land, it is considered appropriate to examine the same while deciding the main batch of appeals. In the additional evidence, the landowners seek permission to lead in evidence a sale deed dated 23.03.2006 (Annexure A-1), with respect to a plot measuring 240 square yards, located in village Jandali which was sold for ₹5,80,000/-. As already noticed, the landowners have produced a large number of sale deeds of smaller sized plots. There is an extremely remote possibility that the plot in the said sale deed measuring only 240 square yards will be used for agricultural purposes. It is further evident from a careful perusal of the aforesaid sale deed that the plot measuring 240 square yards has been sold in a developed area, for the reason that, while giving description of the plot, the plot has been identified by certain plot numbers located on the North-Southern side. In this sale deed, the plot No. 46 measuring 240 square yards has been sold. In the considered view of this Bench, the aforesaid sale instance does not advance the case of the landowners.

9. **DECISION**

9.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and discussion, it is, thereby, held that the judgment, passed by the RC dated 28.10.2016 with regard to the first acquisition and the judgments dated 09.11.2016, 25.03.2019 & 16.04.2021, passed by the RCs, in different batches with regard to the second acquisition are hereby set aside. Further, it is held that the awards passed by the Collector dated 03.03.2009 (Award No.4 in the first acquisition) and 17.07.2009 (Award No. 3 in the second acquisition) are correct. Consequently, the appeals filed by the State of Haryana are allowed and the appeals as well as cross-objections, filed by the landowners, are hereby dismissed.

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

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

January 19, 2022
“DK”

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

Sr.No	Case No.	Petitioner's Name	Respondent's Name
1.	RFA-1616-2017	AVINASH KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
2.	RFA-1622-2017	DEVINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
3.	RFA-1835-2017	RAM SARUP	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
4.	RFA-1845-2017	JOGINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
5.	RFA-1853-2017	RAJNI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
6.	RFA-2084-2017	BALJEET KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
7.	RFA-2378-2017	PERM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
8.	RFA-2394-2017	SANTOKH SINGH	TATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

45

9.	RFA-2415-2017	BALDEV SINGH & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
10.	RFA-2419-2017	MEHAR SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
11.	RFA-2567-2017	SMT. ANU	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS L.A.C. SECTOR-8 PANCHKULA
12.	RFA-2953-2017	BHUPESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS L.A.C. SECTOR-8 PANCHKULA
13.	RFA-3145-2017	KUSHLA RANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
14.	RFA-3404-2017	DAVINDER GAUD	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
15.	RFA-3431-2017	KOMAL GUPTA	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS L.A.C. SECTOR-8 PANCHKULA
16.	RFA-3432-2017	KAILASH RANI	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS L.A.C. SECTOR-8 PANCHKULA
17.	RFA-5109-2017	SHAMSHER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA THR LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR URBAN ESTATE, HR SEC-8, PANCHKULA AND ANOTHER
18.	RFA-5374-2017	BALWANT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
19.	RFA-5410-2017	SUKHDEV SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA
20.	RFA-463-2018	SATWINDER KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
21.	RFA-1040-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	AVINASH KAUR
22.	RFA-1050-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JAGDISH PARSHAD
23.	RFA-3825-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MEHAR SINGH AND ANOTHER
24.	RFA-3829-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	UJJAGAR SINGH
25.	RFA-4375-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DEVINDER SINGH
26.	RFA-212-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJNI
27.	RFA-1626-2017	HARNAIK SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
28.	RFA-466-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LADN ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	SHYAM SUNDER

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

46

29.	RFA-587-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LADN ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	MANJU JOSHI AND ANOTHER
30.	RFA-637-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJ KUMAR
31.	RFA-696-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PREM SINGH
32.	RFA-711-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMAR SHREE
33.	RFA-488-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KUSHLA RANI
34.	RFA-514-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DEVINDER GAUD
35.	RFA-516-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SAKASH CHABRA
36.	RFA-521-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SANTOKH SINGH
37.	RFA-522-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALDEV SINGH AND ORS
38.	RFA-529-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARJINDER KAUR AND OTHERS
39.	XOBJR-159-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARJINDER KAUR AND ORS
40.	RFA-528-2021	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LADN ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	SUKHDEV SINGH
41.	RFA-540-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JOGINDER SINGH
42.	RFA-542-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALJEET KAUR
43.	RFA-544-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LAKHWINDER KAUR
44.	XOBJR-160-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LAKHWINDER KAUR
45.	RFA-549-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHAMSHER SINGH
46.	RFA-594-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALDEV RAJ AND OTHERS
47.	RFA-598-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	BHADUR SINGH
48.	RFA-603-2021	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LADN ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	KAILASH RANI
49.	RFA-610-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SATWINDER KAUR
50.	RFA-618-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALWANT SINGH

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

47

51.	RFA-621-2021	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LADN ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	ANU
52.	RFA-628-2021	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LADN ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	SURINDER PAL KAUR
53.	RFA-638-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SARUP
54.	RFA-4073-2012	MANINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA
55.	RFA-4657-2017	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJINDER KUMAR AND ORS
56.	RFA-1376-2021	BHRAMJEET SINGH RAGHAV	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
57.	RFA-2117-2021	SATBIR SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
58.	RFA-2134-2021	USHA RANI	STATE OF HARYANA
59.	RFA-2147-2021	HEM RAJ	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
60.	RFA-2306-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	TARA DEVI
61.	RFA-2311-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KAMALJIT SINGH
62.	RFA-2326-2017	SATINDERJIT SINGH @ JUGNU	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
63.	RFA-2504-2019	MANJIT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
64.	RFA-3007-2019	TARA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
65.	RFA-3153-2019	CHANDER KALA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
66.	RFA-3317-2017	RAJINDER KUMAR AND ANOTHER.	SARAN SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THRU HIS LRS AND ORS.
67.	RFA-2673-2021	KAMALJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
68.	RFA-5413-2017	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	JARNAIL
69.	RFA-5414-2017	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. BABITA JAIN
70.	RFA-5415-2017	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	ARVINDPAL SINGH
71.	RFA-445-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. VIJAY LUXMI
72.	RFA-446-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. SAROJ RANI
73.	RFA-447-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	KIRPAL KAUR & ORS
74.	RFA-448-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	RAMESH SINGLA
75.	RFA-449-2018	STATE OF HARYANA &	JAGTARAN SINGH AND ORS

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

48

		ANOTHER	
76.	RFA-450-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	MOHINDERPAL SINGH
77.	RFA-451-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SINGH RAM & ORS
78.	RFA-452-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SH. AMRITPAL SINGH & ORS
79.	RFA-453-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. GURMEET KAUR & ORS
80.	RFA-454-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	NIRMAL SINGH & ORS
81.	RFA-455-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	AMARNATH
82.	RFA-456-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	BIRA @ RAGHBIR KUMAR
83.	RFA-457-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. MOORTI DEVI
84.	RFA-458-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SURINDER KUMAR & ANOTHER
85.	RFA-459-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SURINDER SINGH
86.	RFA-460-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. JAGDEEP KAUR & ORS
87.	RFA-476-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	MANJIT SINGH KAPOOR
88.	RFA-477-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	KIRAN BALA & ANOTHER
89.	RFA-478-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SH. SURINDER PAL SINGH
90.	RFA-479-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	HARPAL SINGH & ORS
91.	RFA-772-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SURINDER NANDRA
92.	RFA-773-2018	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT. RANJANA ARORA
93.	RFA-774-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	RAGHBIR SINGH
94.	RFA-775-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	KEDAR NATH
95.	RFA-776-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	JOGINDER SINGH & ORS
96.	RFA-777-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	KARNAIL SINGH
97.	RFA-778-2018	STATE OF HARYANA	AVTAR SINGH
98.	RFA-779-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. BANTO & ORS
99.	RFA-795-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SANJAY KUMAR
100.	RFA-796-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	HARIMITTAR
101.	RFA-797-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	NARENDER PAL SINGH GULIANI
102.	RFA-799-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	RATTAN LAL

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

49

103.	RFA-800-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	KARNAIL SINGH & ORS
104.	RFA-807-2018	STATE OF HARYANA	CHAMAN LAL GUPTA
105.	RFA-820-2018	STATE OF HARYANA	LAJPAT RAI
106.	RFA-938-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	RULDA (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LR'S
107.	RFA-939-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SMT. NACHCHTAR KAUR & OTHERS
108.	RFA-940-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KARAM SINGH AND ANOTHER
109.	RFA-941-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MADHU VIZ
110.	RFA-942-2018	STATE OF HARYANA ANOTHER	MANJIT KAUR
111.	RFA-943-2018	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT RANJANA ARORA
112.	RFA-944-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUKHPAL SINGH AND OTHERS
113.	RFA-945-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARPAL SINGH
114.	RFA-946-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJIT SINGH
115.	RFA-947-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DR NARENDER PAUL JINDAL
116.	RFA-948-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALDEV SINGH AND ORS
117.	RFA-949-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KARNAIL SINGH AND ORS
118.	RFA-950-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MOHINDER SINGH
119.	RFA-951-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DHARAMPAL AND ORS
120.	RFA-952-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURMEL SINGH
121.	RFA-953-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JANAK RAJ
122.	RFA-1069-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	BALDEV SINGH
123.	RFA-742-2017	KEDAR NATH	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR URBAN ESTATE SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA AND ANOTHER
124.	RFA-1433-2017	SURINDER PAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
125.	RFA-1434-2017	JOGINDER SINGH & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
126.	RFA-1435-2017	MOHINDER PAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
127.	RFA-1436-2017	KIRPAL KAUR SINCE DECEASED THR LRS & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
128.	RFA-1437-2017	JAGDEEP KAUR & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
129.	RFA-1438-2017	AVTAR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

50

130.	RFA-1439-2017	AMRITPAL SINGH & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
131.	RFA-1474-2017	MANISHA MANOCHA	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
132.	RFA-1475-2017	KARAM SINGH & ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
133.	RFA-1509-2017	JAGTARAN SINGH & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
134.	RFA-1822-2017	BALDEV SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
135.	RFA-1823-2017	SH. RATTAN LAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
136.	RFA-1973-2017	KIRAN BALA & ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
137.	RFA-2308-2017	NIRMAL SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
138.	RFA-2309-2017	SURINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
139.	RFA-2310-2017	HARPAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
140.	RFA-2311-2017	BALDEV SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
141.	RFA-2312-2017	SINGH RAM AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
142.	RFA-2313-2017	HARPAL SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
143.	RFA-2574-2017	MADHU VIZ	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
144.	RFA-2578-2017	JANAK RAJ	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
145.	RFA-2580-2017	SANJAY KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
146.	RFA-2581-2017	DR. NARINDER PAL JINDAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
147.	RFA-2582-2017	SURINDER NANDRA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
148.	RFA-2669-2017	GURMEET KAUR THROUGH HER GENERAL ATTORNEY SH. BHUPINDER SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
149.	RFA-2690-2017	SURINDER KUMAR & ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
150.	RFA-2691-2017	SMT. NACHHATAR KAUR & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
151.	RFA-2750-2017	MOHINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
152.	RFA-2801-2017	SUKHPAL SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
153.	RFA-2813-2017	CHAMAN LAL GUPTA	STATE OF HARYANA
154.	RFA-3318-2017	BIRA @ RAGHBIR KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
155.	RFA-3789-2017	RAMESH SINGLA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
156.	RFA-3795-2017	BABITA JAIN	STATE OF HARYANA AND

			ANOTHER
157.	RFA-3796-2017	AMAR NATH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
158.	RFA-3800-2017	HARI MITTAR SINCE DECEASED THRU HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
159.	RFA-4023-2017	BANTO (NOW DECEASED) THR LRS AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
160.	RFA-4024-2017	DHARAM PAL AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
161.	RFA-4901-2017	VIJAY LUXMI	STATE OF HARYANA
162.	RFA-5304-2017	ARVIND PAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
163.	RFA-5573-2017	LAJPAT RAI (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA
164.	RFA-169-2018	MANJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
165.	RFA-323-2018	RULDA (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
166.	RFA-895-2020	RAGHBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
167.	RFA-485-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SINGH
168.	RFA-487-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JAGIR KAUR
169.	RFA-490-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SHARMILA
170.	RFA-491-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. URMILA THAKUR
171.	RFA-496-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURINDER PAL SINGH
172.	RFA-499-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JANIK DEVI
173.	RFA-500-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GOBIND SINGH
174.	RFA-502-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. KANWALJEET KAUR AND ANOTHER
175.	RFA-512-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SARAVJIT KAUR
176.	RFA-517-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAVINDER KUMAR
177.	RFA-525-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. MEENA BIST AND OTHERS
178.	RFA-526-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURMAIL KAUR
179.	RFA-530-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH KUMAR
180.	RFA-531-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHRI SATPAL
181.	RFA-534-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. MALIKA KANSAL
182.	RFA-539-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. GURBACHAN KAUR

183.	RFA-543-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SARVJIT SINGH AND ANOTHER
184.	RFA-545-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARVINDER SINGH
185.	RFA-547-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BINA RANI
186.	RFA-548-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ANGREJ SINGH AND OTHERS
187.	RFA-551-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS	MOHINDER KAUR AND ANOTHER
188.	RFA-1039-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS	SARVJIT SINGH
189.	RFA-600-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURMEET KAUR
190.	RFA-609-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LAKHWINDER KAUR
191.	RFA-612-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. NASIB KAUR AND OTHERS
192.	RFA-3918-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	BALDEV SINGH
193.	RFA-4970-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	HARBILAS SINGH
194.	RFA-5075-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURDEV SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS & ORS
195.	RFA-5076-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	RUMAL KAUR
196.	RFA-5077-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	JASWINDER SINGH
197.	RFA-5078-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	PARAMJIT SINGH
198.	RFA-5080-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	SAHAB KAUR
199.	RFA-5081-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	RULDA SINGH
200.	RFA-5082-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	HARBHAJAN SINGH & ANOTHER
201.	RFA-5083-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	HARJIT SINGH
202.	RFA-5084-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DIDAR SINGH @ DARA SINGH
203.	RFA-5085-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	GURTEJ SINGH
204.	RFA-5087-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER	BUDH RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS
205.	RFA-5089-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SAHAB SINGH & ORS
206.	RFA-5200-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ROSHAN LAL
207.	RFA-5201-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURCHARAN SINGH
208.	RFA-614-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND	PARAMJEET KAUR

		ANOTHER	
209.	RFA-615-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PROMILA RANI
210.	RFA-634-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. GURMEET KAUR
211.	RFA-57-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURMEET SINGH
212.	RFA-58-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARMOHINDER SINGH
213.	RFA-59-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JARNAIL SINGH
214.	RFA-60-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JARNAIL SINGH
215.	RFA-61-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARBANS SINGH
216.	RFA-62-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANGATVEER SINGH
217.	RFA-63-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUKHWINDER KAUR
218.	RFA-64-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NAIB SINGH
219.	RFA-66-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PAYARA LAL @ PYARA SINGH (DECEASED) THORUGH HIS LRS
220.	RFA-67-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SARDARA SINGH
221.	RFA-68-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURMAIL SINGH
222.	RFA-69-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AVTAR SINGH
223.	RFA-71-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LABH SINGH
224.	RFA-72-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AVTAR SINGH
225.	RFA-1034-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	SHAMSHER SINGH
226.	RFA-1035-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	SMT. KARAMJIT KAUR AND OTHERS
227.	RFA-1036-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	GURMAIL SINGH
228.	RFA-1037-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	SMT. ISHRO DEVI
229.	RFA-1041-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	SHUGAN CHAND GUPTA
230.	RFA-1043-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	VIKRANTPAL SINGH MINOR SON OF MOHINDER SINGH AND

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

54

			OTHERS
231.	RFA-1044-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	GURMAIL SINGH
232.	RFA-1045-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GRAM PANCHAYAT KANWLA THROUGH ITS SARPANCH
233.	RFA-1046-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR PANCHKULA	SHRI RAJ KUMAR
234.	RFA-1047-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, PANCHKULA	PURAN SINGH AND ANOTHER
235.	RFA-1049-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR	SMT. SEEMA DEVI
236.	RFA-1051-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER	DAHARAM PAL
237.	RFA-1052-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NIRANJAN SINGH AND OTHERS
238.	RFA-3823-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANPREET SINGH ALIAS MANDEEP SINGH
239.	RFA-3824-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NIDHI CHAUDHARY
240.	RFA-3826-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMARJIT KAUR
241.	RFA-3827-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ANGREZ SINGH AND ANOTHER
242.	RFA-3828-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. BALJIT KAUR AND ANOTHER
243.	RFA-3830-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PAL SINGH
244.	RFA-3831-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. PAL KAUR @ HARPAL KAUR
245.	RFA-3832-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM CHANDER AND OTHERS
246.	RFA-3833-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	CHET SINGH
247.	RFA-3834-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURPREET SINGH AND ANOTHER
248.	RFA-3835-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DALBIR SINGH
249.	RFA-3836-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHAMSHER SINGH
250.	RFA-3837-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LABH SINGH
251.	RFA-3838-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURPAL SINGH AND ANOTHER
252.	RFA-3839-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURDEV RAM AND ANOTHER

253.	RFA-3840-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SARDARO DEVI
254.	RFA-3841-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURDEV KAUR
255.	RFA-3842-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANN SINGH
256.	RFA-3901-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMAR SINGH
257.	RFA-3902-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SATINDERJIT SINGH ALIAS JUGNU SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS
258.	RFA-3903-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NIDHAN SINGH
259.	RFA-3904-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LUXMI DEVI AND OTHERS
260.	RFA-3905-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PAYARE LAL
261.	RFA-3906-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KRISHNA DEVI AND OTHERS
262.	RFA-3907-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JARNAIL KAUR
263.	RFA-3908-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALKAR SINGH
264.	RFA-3909-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUKHWINDER SINGH
265.	RFA-3910-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PRITAM SINGH
266.	RFA-3911-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	VIKRAM SINGH
267.	RFA-3912-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. VEERANWALI AND OTHERS
268.	RFA-3913-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SANTOKH SINGH
269.	RFA-3914-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJESH AND ANOTHER
270.	RFA-3915-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURPREET SINGH
271.	RFA-3916-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURDEV SINGH
272.	RFA-3917-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BACHNA
273.	RFA-3918-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT SURINDER KAUR ALIAS KRISHNA DEVI
274.	RFA-3919-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. RAJ RANI AND OTHERS
275.	RFA-3920-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JASPAL KAUR
276.	RFA-3921-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHYAM LAL
277.	RFA-3923-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. KAMLA DEVI
278.	RFA-3924-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND	AMARJIT SINGH

		ANOTHER	
279.	RFA-4363-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GOPAL DASS
280.	RFA-4365-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURMAIL SINGH AND ANOTHER
281.	RFA-4366-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SARWAN SINGH
282.	RFA-4367-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SH. JASBIR SINGH AND ANOTHER
283.	RFA-4368-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMRIK SINGH
284.	RFA-4369-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES, SCO NO.61,SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	MANINDER SINGH
285.	RFA-4370-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURDAS SINGH
286.	RFA-4371-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE COLLECTOR, AMBALA	GIAN CHAND AND ANOTHER
287.	RFA-4372-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KARNAIL KAUR
288.	RFA-4376-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SARWAN SINGH
289.	RFA-4377-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DEVRAJ
290.	RFA-4378-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARAMJEET KAUR
291.	RFA-4379-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ASHA SHARMA
292.	RFA-4380-2019	STATE OF HARYANA	KANTA RANI
293.	RFA-4381-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SATPAL AND OTHERS
294.	RFA-4382-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAMPAL
295.	RFA-4383-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JEERAM
296.	RFA-203-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LAKHMIR SINGH
297.	RFA-204-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	CHARANJIT SINGH
298.	RFA-206-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARDEV SINGH
299.	RFA-207-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SANURADHA
300.	RFA-208-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES, SCO NO.61,SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	GURPAL SINGH AND OTHERS

301.	RFA-209-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GOBIND SINGH
302.	RFA-210-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMRIK SINGH
303.	RFA-211-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJIT SINGH
304.	RFA-214-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	RAMU SHARMA
305.	RFA-465-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. VIDYA DEVI
306.	RFA-467-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DINESH SINGH RAWAT
307.	RFA-469-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DHARAMVIR SINGH
308.	RFA-471-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RANBIR SINGH
309.	RFA-472-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. USHA
310.	RFA-473-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SAWAN SINGH
311.	RFA-474-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM KISHAN
312.	RFA-475-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURDEV SINGH AND OTHERS
313.	RFA-476-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALWINDER SINGH
314.	RFA-477-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	JASWANT SINGH
315.	RFA-481-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RANJIT SINGH
316.	RFA-482-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJEET SINGH AND OTHERS
317.	RFA-483-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ANJU
318.	RFA-485-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMAR PARKASH GOEL
319.	RFA-487-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KARAMJEET KAUR AND OTHERS
320.	RFA-488-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, URBAN ESTATE, HARYANA, PANCHKULA.	AVTAR SINGH
321.	RFA-579-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NASIB KAUR AND OTHERS
322.	RFA-580-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MALKIAT KAUR
323.	RFA-581-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALBIR SINGH
324.	RFA-582-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARDEEP KUMAR SAIGAL
325.	RFA-583-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	RAMA RANI AND ANOTHER

326.	RFA-585-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-67, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	DIDAR SINGH
327.	RFA-588-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	SH. RAHUL GUPTA
328.	RFA-589-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT. VEETA ARORA
329.	RFA-591-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. REKHA GOYAL
330.	RFA-592-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	DIDAR SINGH
331.	RFA-594-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT. KUSAM BALA
332.	RFA-595-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT. SAROJ MITTAL
333.	RFA-596-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUNIL MAHAJAN AND ANOTHER
334.	RFA-601-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	SHUGAN CHAND GUPTA
335.	RFA-602-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJINDER KUMAR
336.	RFA-603-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JARNAIL SINGH AND ANOTHER
337.	RFA-636-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SANDEEP KUMAR TIWARI
338.	RFA-638-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AJAY KUMAR
339.	RFA-639-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JARNAIL SINGH
340.	RFA-640-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARNEK SINGH
341.	RFA-641-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. MEENA
342.	RFA-642-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JAGDISH PARSHAD
343.	RFA-643-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MOHIT KUMAR
344.	RFA-644-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HAYAT SINGH
345.	RFA-645-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHYAM LAL
346.	RFA-646-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMRIK SINGH
347.	RFA-648-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KAILASH RANI
348.	RFA-649-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. VEENA RANI
349.	RFA-651-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMARJIT KAUR
350.	RFA-653-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMRIK SINGH
351.	RFA-654-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BABU SINGH AND OTHERS
352.	RFA-655-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HANS RAJ AND ORS
353.	RFA-656-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. MEENAKSHI GOEL

354.	RFA-657-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALWINDER KUMAR
355.	RFA-658-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. LEELA WATI DEVI
356.	RFA-659-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANOJ KUMAR AND ORS
357.	RFA-660-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JASBIR KAUR
358.	RFA-661-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JASWANT RAM AND ANOTHER
359.	RFA-682-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NARESH KUMAR AND ANOTHER
360.	RFA-683-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURINDER KUMAR
361.	RFA-684-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ANIL KUMAR
362.	RFA-685-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR PANCHKULA	URMILA DEVI
363.	RFA-686-2020	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, SCO-61, SECTOR-8, PANCHKULA	HARBANS KAUR
364.	RFA-687-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LABH SINGH AND OTHERS
365.	RFA-689-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MISHRA QUERESHI
366.	RFA-690-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARVEEN KUMAR THROUGH HIS GENERAL POWER OF ATTORNEY
367.	RFA-693-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. KRISHNA DEVI
368.	RFA-694-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GHANSHYAM LAL MURARI (G.S.L.MURARI)
369.	RFA-697-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. VEENA RANI
370.	RFA-700-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DAYA SINGH
371.	RFA-701-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	TEJPAL
372.	RFA-702-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. RAVINDER KAUR
373.	RFA-703-2020	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT. MAHAVEER
374.	RFA-704-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJEET KAUR AND ANOTHER
375.	RFA-709-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SATISH KUMAR
376.	RFA-2278-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NAR SINGH DASS ACHINT
377.	RFA-1614-2017	RAM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
378.	RFA-1615-2017	GURMAIL KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER

379.	RFA-1617-2017	RAMU SHARMA	STATE OF HARYANA
380.	RFA-1618-2017	PROMILA RANI	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
381.	RFA-1620-2017	JARNAIL SINGH & ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
382.	RFA-1619-2017	SARWAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
383.	RFA-1621-2017	HARJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
384.	RFA-1624-2017	SARAVJIT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
385.	RFA-1625-2017	KAILASH RANI	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
386.	RFA-1827-2017	SURINDER KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
387.	FA-1830-2017	ANIL KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
388.	RFA-1833-2017	SMT. MENAKSHI GOEL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
389.	RFA-1834-2017	MALKIAT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
390.	RFA-1837-2017	PARVEEN KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
391.	RFA-1838-2017	BALJIT KAUR AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
392.	RFA-1841-2017	AMRIK SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
393.	RFA-1842-2017	MANJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
394.	RFA-1843-2017	JARNAIL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
395.	RFA-1844-2017	BINA RANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
396.	RFA-1847-2017	SURINDER PAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
397.	RFA-1854-2017	LABH SINGH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
398.	RFA-1855-2017	PARAMJIT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
399.	RFA-1856-2017	SMT. MALIKA KANSAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
400.	RFA-1857-2017	GURMEET KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
401.	RFA-1859-2017	NARESH KUMAR AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
402.	RFA-1979-2017	NARSINGH DASS ACHINT	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
403.	RFA-2015-2017	DIDAR SINGH (DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA
404.	RFA-2016-2017	AMARJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
405.	RFA-2017-2017	HARDEV SINGH (DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

406.	RFA-2018-2017	DEV RAJ	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
407.	RFA-2019-2017	BALDEV SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
408.	RFA-2021-2017	PARVINDER KAUR & ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
409.	RFA-2078-2017	SAHAB KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
410.	RFA-2079-2017	JASWANT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
411.	RFA-2080-2017	RAJINDER KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
412.	RFA-2081-2017	PARVINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
413.	RFA-2082-2017	GIAN CHAND AND ANOTHER.	STATE OF HARYANA
414.	RFA-2085-2017	NIRANJAN SINGH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
415.	RFA-2086-2017	BALJINDER KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
416.	RFA-2088-2017	VIKRANT PAL SINGH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
417.	RFA-2090-2017	HANS RAJ SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
418.	RFA-2291-2017	AMRIK SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
419.	RFA-2292-2017	SMT. URMILA THAKUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
420.	RFA-2293-2017	KIRNA RANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
421.	RFA-2294-2017	HARNEK SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
422.	RFA-2295-2017	NIDHI CHAUDHARY	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
423.	RFA-2296-2017	DHARAMVIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
424.	RFA-2297-2017	SANURADHA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
425.	RFA-2298-2017	RAVINDER KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
426.	RFA-2299-2017	SMT.VEETA ARORA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
427.	RFA-2326-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJIT KAUR
428.	RFA-2328-2017	JASWANT RAM AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
429.	RFA-2329-2017	RUMAL KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
430.	RFA-2330-2017	SMT. RAVINDER KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
431.	RFA-2331-2017	GURMEET SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

62

432.	RFA-2332-2017	GURDEV RAM AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
433.	RFA-2333-2017	ROSHAN LAL (SINCE DECEASED) TH LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
434.	RFA-2334-2017	SARVJIT SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
435.	RFA-2336-2017	NIDHAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
436.	RFA-2337-2017	SMT. SURINDER KAUR @ KRISHNA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
437.	RFA-2338-2017	SMT. ASHA SHARMA (SINCE DECEASED)	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
438.	RFA-2339-2017	SARDARA SINGH THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
439.	RFA-2340-2017	NAIB SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
440.	RFA-2341-2017	CHARANJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
441.	RFA-2346-2017	GURMAIL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
442.	RFA-2347-2017	BACHNA @ BACHAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
443.	RFA-2348-2017	RULDA SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
444.	RFA-2349-2017	SMT. PAL KAUR @ HARPAL KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
445.	RFA-2350-2017	BALKAR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
446.	RFA-2351-2017	SHAMSHER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
447.	RFA-2390-2017	BALBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
448.	RFA-2391-2017	SMT. VEENA RANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
449.	RFA-2392-2017	GURDEV SINGH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
450.	RFA-2396-2017	SMT. VEENA RANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
451.	RFA-2407-2017	PYARA LAL @ PYARA SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
452.	RFA-2408-2017	MANOJ KUMAR AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
453.	RFA-2409-2017	JASPAL KAUR (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
454.	RFA-2410-2017	AMAR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THR LR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
455.	RFA-2411-2017	KRISHNA DEVI ETC	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
456.	RFA-2412-2017	GURCHARAN SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.

457.	RFA-2413-2017	SMT. KAMLA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
458.	RFA-2416-2017	SUKHWINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
459.	RFA-2417-2017	GULAB SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
460.	RFA-2418-2017	BALVINDER KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
461.	RFA-2420-2017	JEE RAM	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
462.	RFA-2421-2017	GURDAS SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
463.	RFA-2422-2017	SARWAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
464.	RFA-2423-2017	SMT. KARAMJIT KAUR AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
465.	RFA-2424-2017	GURTEJ SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
466.	RFA-2425-2017	JARNAIL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
467.	RFA-2426-2017	SUKHWINDER KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
468.	RFA-2428-2017	GURDEV SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
469.	RFA-2429-2017	SMT. VEERAN WALI (DECEASED) THR LRS & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
470.	RFA-2430-2017	RANJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
471.	RFA-2431-2017	LAKHWINDER KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
472.	RFA-2432-2017	SHAYAM LAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
473.	RFA-2433-2017	PRITAM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
474.	RFA-2434-2017	GURPAL SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
475.	RFA-2512-2017	GURDEV KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
476.	RFA-2518-2017	PRADEEP KUMAR SAIGAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
477.	RFA-2519-2017	SMT. USHA	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
478.	RFA-2520-2017	RAM CHANDER & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
479.	RFA-2625-2017	SARDARO DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
480.	RFA-2527-2017	SHAYAM LAL (DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
481.	RFA-2528-2017	SMT. LUXMI DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
482.	RFA-2529-2017	GURPREET SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
483.	RFA-2530-2017	AVTAR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

64

484.	RFA-2531-2017	AMRIK SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
485.	RFA-2532-2017	DAYA SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
486.	RFA-2533-2017	BALWINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
487.	RFA-2534-2017	VIDYA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
488.	RFA-2537-2017	SMT. NASIB KAUR (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
489.	RFA-2538-2017	RAM KISHAN	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
490.	RFA-2539-2017	ANGREZ SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
491.	RFA-2540-2017	LABH SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
492.	RFA-2541-2017	AVTAR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
493.	RFA-2544-2017	MOHIT KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
494.	RFA-2545-2017	DIDAR SINGH @ DARA SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
495.	RFA-2546-2017	DALBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
496.	RFA-2615-2017	SMT. KUSUM BALA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
497.	RFA-2617-2017	SMT.MEENA BIST AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
498.	RFA-2618-2017	GURPAL SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
499.	RFA-2619-2017	RAM PAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
500.	RFA-2620-2017	HARMOHINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
501.	RFA-2621-2017	BUDH RAM	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
502.	RFA-2623-2017	VIKRAM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
503.	RFA-2624-2017	GURMAIL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
504.	RFA-2427-2017	HARBEL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
505.	RFA-2628-2017	LABH SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
506.	RFA-2700-2017	SMT. JARNAIL KAUR (DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
507.	RFA-2701-2017	DIDAR SINGH (DECEASED) THR LRS AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA
508.	RFA-2717-2017	SMT.SEEMA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA
509.	RFA-2718-2017	SMT.KRISHNA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
510.	RFA-2722-2017	SMT.ISHRO DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.

511.	RFA-2723-2017	GRAM PANCHAYAT KANWALA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
512.	RFA-2727-2017	ANGREJ SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
513.	RFA-2741-2017	PAYARE LAL (DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
514.	RFA-2764-2017	HARBHAJAN SINGH ETC	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
515.	RFA-2765-2017	MANGATVIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
516.	RFA-2766-2017	GURPREET SINGH ETC	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
517.	RFA-2848-2017	PARAMJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
518.	RFA-2849-2017	GURDEV SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
519.	RFA-2850-2017	RAMESHWAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
520.	RFA-2851-2017	PARAMJIT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
521.	RFA-2852-2017	PAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
522.	RFA-2853-2017	HARBANS SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
523.	RFA-2854-2017	SANTOKH SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
524.	RFA-2856-2017	JASWINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
525.	RFA-2857-2017	AMRIK SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
526.	RFA-2859-2017	MAAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
527.	RFA-2862-2017	SAHAB SINGH (DECEASED) THR LRS & ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
528.	RFA-2944-2017	SMT.GURBACHAN KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
529.	RFA-2945-2017	SMT. KULDEEP KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
530.	RFA-2947-2017	GOBIND SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
531.	RFA-2948-2017	JASBIR KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
532.	RFA-2949-2017	GURMAIL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
533.	RFA-3226-2017	LAKHMIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
534.	RFA-3401-2017	AVTAR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA
535.	RFA-3402-2017	DAHARAM PAL SINCE DECEASED THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
536.	RFA-3403-2017	SATPAL & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER
537.	RFA-3405-2017	JANKI DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA &

			ANOTHER
538.	RFA-3494-2017	INDU BALA	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS L.A.C. SECTOR-8 PANCHKULA
539.	RFA-4183-2017	BABU SINGH (DECEASED) THR LRS & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
540.	RFA-4184-2017	HARBILAS SINGH (DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
541.	RFA-4185-2017	KARAMJIT KAUR AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
542.	RFA-4510-2017	AMARJIT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
543.	RFA-5383-2017	RAJ KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA
544.	RFA-221-2018	SHUGAN CHAND GUPTA	STATE OF HARYANA
545.	RFA-222-2018	SHUGAN CHAND GUPTA	STATE OF HARYANA
546.	RFA-223-2018	RAHUL GUPTA	STATE OF HARYANA
547.	RFA-562-2018	SARAVJIT SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
548.	RFA-2052-2018	RAMA RANI AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA
549.	RFA-3111-2019	MANINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA, THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR
550.	RFA-3159-2019	AMARJIT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
551.	RFA-2383-2021	MANJEET KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
552.	RFA-2390-2021	KANWALJEET KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
553.	RFA-2626-2017	RANBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
554.	RFA-412-2020	DHARAMVIR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
555.	RFA-2131-2021	BALJIT KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
556.	RFA-2152-2021	BALJEET SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA
557.	RFA-2158-2021	VINKAL BINDRA AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA
558.	RFA-2159-2021	JASBIR KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
559.	RFA-1374-2021	ASHOK KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA
560.	RFA-2300-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJMATI DEVI
561.	RFA-2301-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ASHOK KUMAR
562.	RFA-2303-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJINDER SINGH
563.	RFA-2304-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ONKAR SINGH

**Regular First Appeal No. 484 of 2021 (O&M) AND
Other Connected Cases**

67

564.	RFA-2307-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PAWAN KUMAR AND OTHERS
565.	RFA-2308-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DHARAMVIR
566.	RFA-2309-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	CHANNA
567.	RFA-2310-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DHARAMJEET
568.	RFA-2312-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJIT SINGH AND OTHERS
569.	RFA-2318-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURMUKH SINGH
570.	RFA-2321-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJIT SINGH AND ORS
571.	RFA-2324-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANJIT SINGH AND ORS
572.	RFA-2325-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GURCHARAN SINGH
573.	RFA-2498-2019	SHEELA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
574.	RFA-2499-2019	CHANNA	STATE OF HARYANA
575.	RFA-2503-2019	RAJINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
576.	RFA-2509-2019	RAJMATI DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
577.	RFA-2510-2019	GURMUKH SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
578.	RFA-2660-2019	DHARAMJEET	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
579.	RFA-3128-2019	SMT. SUKBIR KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
580.	RFA-3502-2019	PAWAN KUMAR AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
581.	RFA-604-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARVINDER KAUR(MINOR DAUGHTER) AND ANOTHER
582.	RFA-2726-2017	MANJEET SINGH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER.
583.	RFA-2863-2017	SHAMSHER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
584.	RFA-2652-2021	GHAN SHAYAM LAL MURARI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
585.	RFA-2702-2021	SHASHI BHUSHAN AND OTHERS	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER
586.	RFA-5448-2017	HARBANS KAUR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
587.	RFA-1632-2019	SUNITA RANI AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
588.	RFA-1629-2019	INDERJIT SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
589.	RFA-1628-2019	BHUPINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
590.	RFA-1631-2019	AJMER KAUR AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

591.	RFA-6346-2018	KARNAIL SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
592.	RFA-6345-2018	SAMSHER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
593.	RFA-6347-2018	KARNAIL SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
594.	RFA-6349-2018	GURMEL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
595.	RFA-6348-2018	KARNAIL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
596.	RFA-647-2020	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KIRNA RANI
597.	RFA-861-2020	SATPAL	STATE OF HARYANA
598.	RFA-2154-2021	GOPAL DASS AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
599.	RFA-798-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. MANISHA MANOCHA
600.	RFA-489-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. KULDEEP KAUR
601.	RFA-1381-2021	RAKESH SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
602.	RFA-2129-2021	AMIT KUMAR AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
603.	RFA-2135-2021	KULDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
604.	RFA-2136-2021	KRIPAL KAUR THROUGH HER SPA HARJINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA
605.	RFA-2143-2021	JAI PARKASH JADEV	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
606.	RFA-2141-2021	RAJNI RANI AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
607.	RFA-4336-2019	NARENDER PAL SINGH GULIANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER