

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

RFA-1589-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 01.11.2022
Reserved on: 26.08.2022

State of Haryana

....Appellant

Versus

Baldev Singh and another

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Sh.Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana
Mr. Jagram Singh Cooner, Advocate for the
landowners

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. Background and Introduction:-

1.1 While praying for the modification of the market value assessed in two different awards passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the RC'), the landowners as well as the State of Haryana have come up in the appeal. Notifications under Section 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as the 'LAC') are common. The RC, by two different awards, passed on 16.03.2017 and 25.01.2021 respectively, has assessed the market value of the acquired land. Learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that this batch of appeals (the details whereof are at the foot of the judgment) can conveniently be disposed of by a common judgment.

1.2 The relevant particulars of the said acquisition are as under:-

**RFA-1589-2019 (O&M)
and other connected cases**

2

Sr No	Date	Particulars
1	27.06.2007	Preliminary notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued intending to acquire the land for remodeling of Model Town Drain. The proposal was to acquire 21 kanals and 1 marla of land located in village Kanwli, 23 kanals and 6 marlas in village Jandli and 53 kanals and 18 marlas of land located in Village Anandpur Jalbera
2.	28.06.2007	Declaration under Section 6 was published
3.	31.10.2007	Vide award no.32, the LAC offered to pay market value at the rate of Rs.8,00,000/- per acre alongwith all the statutory benefits
4.	30.10.2014	In the first round, the RC assessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.499/- per square yard
5.	23.08.2016	In Jasdev Singh and others vs. Land Acquisition Collector, Directorate of Urban Estate Haryana, RFA No.1302 of 2015 decided on 23.08.2016, the High Court set aside the award passed by the RC while remanding the case for fresh decision.
6.	16.03.2017	In the second round, the RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land at the following rates:- Village Anandpur Jalbera = Rs.840/- per square yard Village Jandli = Rs.900/- per square yard Village Kanwli = Rs.1026/- per square yard
7	25.01.2021	While deciding 4 separate reference petitions, the RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land in Village Jandli at the rate of Rs.900/- per square yard, whereas, market value of the acquired land at Village Kanwli has been assessed at Rs.1026/- per square yard

Facts:-

1.3 In order to project the potentiality of the acquired land, the landowners have claimed that the market value of the acquired land was not less than Rs.1 crore per acre as it is located at a distance of 4-5 kms from the boundary of the Municipal Committee of the Ambala City as well as Model Town, Ambala City. There are numerous factories, petrol

pumps and schools surrounding the acquired land and VATICA Company has purchased the land in neighbouring Villages namely Kanwli, Jandli, Saunda at the rate of Rs.97,00,000/- per acre. Some landowners have also sought damages towards the severance and fragmentation of their unacquired land (remaining land left with the landowners after acquisition).

1.4 While contesting the reference petitions, the State has submitted that the LAC while assessing the market value took into consideration all the factors like location, nature, potential value, market price of the acquired land etc. Therefore, the award passed by the LAC is just, fair and adequate.

2. Oral and Documentary evidence:-

2.1 In the oral evidence, the landowners examined the following witnesses:-

PW1	Mura Saki Lal Sharma
PW2	Rajinder Kumar, Halqa Patwari of Village Anandpur Jalbera
PW3	Jai Singh
PW4	Surinder Mohan Mittal, Registered Architect

2.2 In documentary evidence, the landowners relied upon the following documents in support of their case.

Ex.	Court award with date of decision	Date of notification u/s 4 of the Act	Village	Value assssed by the Court
P4	LAC no.174 of 2003 'Gurdeep Vs. State' decided on 29.08.2009	06.07.2000	Sonda	Rs.423 per sq. yard

P5	LAC No.9 of 2010 'Baldev Vs. State' decided on 24.04.2012	20.07.2006	Kanwla, Kanwli, Jandli	Rs.499 per sq. yard
P6	LAC No. 69 of 2010 'Babita Jain vs. State' decided on 29.08.2014	28.02.2006	Jandli, Kanwli, Sonda and Sarrai Mehdood	Rs.2950/- per sq. yard

Ex.	Sale deed number and date	Area	Total consideration price	Price per acre	Village
P-2	320 dated 18.04.2013	1A-7K- 15M	80,00,000	40,63,492/-	Anandpur Jalbera
P-3	1006 03.05.2005	36.66 square yards	1,23,000	1,62,38,953/-	Anandpur Jalbera

2.3 On the other hand, in oral evidence, the State of Haryana examined RW1 Jeet Ram, Patwari, office of LAC, Panchkula.

2.4 In documentary evidence, the landowners produced the following sale deeds:-

Ex.	Number and Date of sale deed	Area sold	Total consideration price	Price per acre	Village
R1	6977/ 30.03.2007	3K-4M	2,40,000/-	6,00,000/-	Anandpur Jalbera
R2	4050/ 14.12.2007	1 Acre	6,00,000/-	6,00,000/-	Anandpur Jalbera
R3	4369/ 03.01.2008	9 M	45,000/-	8,00,000	Anandpur Jalbera
R4	1373/ 30.06.2008	2K-1M	1,60,000/-	.6,24,390/-	Jandli

2.5 After receipt of files from the High Court, the State once again, examined, RW1 Rajinder Singh, Patwari.

2.6 In documentary evidence, the State produced the following sale instances:-

Ex.	Number and Date of sale deed	Area sold	Total consideration price	Price per acre	Village
R1	3988/ 04.07.2005	04 K	3,00,000/-	6,00,000/-	Kanwli
R2	2927/ 03.07.2006	9A-6K-14M	68,86,250/-	7,00,000/-	Kanwli
R3	200/ 13.04.2006	4K-17 M	4,25,000/-	7,01,031/-	Kanwla
R4	1549/ 16.05.2005	05K-07M	.4,02,000/-	.6,01,121/-	Kanwli

2.7 It may be noted here that the sale instances produced by the State of Haryana have been assigned duplicate exhibit numbers. Hence, hereinafter, the sale instances will be referred to by their numbers in order to make a distinction.

2.8 In the file of a separate award passed on 25.01.2021 by the RC, the landowners examined the following witnesses in oral evidence:-

PW1	Baldev Singh
PW2	Avtar Singh
PW3	Virender Singh

2.9 Apart from that, in documentary evidence, the landowners produced the following documents:-

Ex.	Sale deed number and date	Area	Total consideration price	Price per acre	Village
P-3	14308 22.03.2006	240 sq.yds	5,80,000/-	1,16,96,667/-	Jandli
P-4	5093 15.12.2006	24.44 sq.yds	1,26,000/-	2,49,52,537/-	Jandli
P-5	5344 28.12.2006	201.sq.yards	7,00,000/-	1,68,55,721	Jandli
P-6	1678 29.06.2007	200 sq.yards	10,00,000/-	2,42,00,000/-	Kanwla

**RFA-1589-2019 (O&M)
and other connected cases** **6**

P-7	8571 14.11.2005	208 sq.yards	4,27,000/-	99,35,962/-	Kanwla
-----	--------------------	--------------	------------	-------------	--------

List of other documents produced by the landowners:-

Sr.No.	Particulars
1.	Ex.PW3/B Copy of Jamabandi Village Kanwli
2.	Ex.PW3/C Original copy of Akash Sizra
3.	Ex.P1-Copy of Award Dt.28.10.2016 passed by Sh.Rakesh Singh, ADJ/Ambala
4.	Ex.P2-Copy of RFA No.5605/2009 Dt.05.08.2015 passed by Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Sabina
5.	Ex.PX-Copy of Jambandi Village Jandli Year 2006-2007
6.	Ex.PWw4/s- Site plan of acquired land and its surroundings

2.10 On the other hand, the State of Haryana in documentary evidence produced a copy of the RC's judgment dated 16.03.2017 as Ex.R1.

3.Discussion and Analysis :-

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

3.2 On a careful perusal of the impugned judgment dated 16.03.2017, it is evident that the RC, while refusing to rely upon the various awards passed by the RC, has relied upon Ex.P3 i.e a sale deed bearing no.1006, dated 03.05.2005 with respect to plot no.46 measuring 36.66 square yards, located in Village Anandpur Jalbera, The court applied deduction @ 75% on the price reflected in the sale deed No.1006 and arrived at a figure of Rs.838.75/- per square yard as market value

prevalent in the month of May, 2005. Thus, the RC assessed the market value of the land situated at Village Anandpur Jalbera at Rs.840/- per square yard. With respect to the acquired land located in Villages Jandli and Kanwli, the court relied upon the previous assessment made by the RC in award Ex.PXX decided on 28.10.2016 while assessing the market value prevalent on 28.02.2006. The RC has refused to take into consideration the sale deeds produced by the State on the ground that these sale instances reflect a price lower than the amount offered by the LAC while wrongly interpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act.

3.3 At this stage, it is important to note that RC's award dated 28.10.2016 Ex.PXX has already been set aside in **State of Haryana vs. Baljinder Kaur and others RFA No. 484 of 2021** and other connected cases decided on 19.01.2022. Thus, the basis on which the market value of the acquired land located in Villages Jandli and Kanwli had been assessed ceases to exist. This Court, in the afore-mentioned RFA, has restored the award passed by the LAC. The learned counsel, representing the landowners, does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspect.

3.4 On the one hand, the learned counsel representing the State of Haryana, while criticizing the impugned judgment, has contended that the RC, without realizing that the sale instance bearing no. 1006 with respect to a plot measuring 36.66 square yards is not comparable with the acquired land, has proceeded to assess the market value. He submits that as many as eight sale deeds produced/proved by the State clearly depict that the market value of the acquired land was in the range of

Rs.6,00,000/- to Rs.7,00,000/- per acre, during the contemporaneous period. He contends that the aforesaid sale instances have not been taken into consideration by the RC due to wrong interpretation of Section 25 of the 1894 Act. On the other hand, the learned counsel representing the landowners contends that 75% deduction applied by the RC is excessive whereas, only 1/3rd deduction should be applied in this case.

3.5 After having heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length, this Court proceeds to analyze the reasons put forth by the respective parties as well as the award of the RC.

3.6 It is evident that the RC has committed a material irregularity, while wrongly interpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act and ignoring the sale deeds reflecting a price lower than the amount offered by the LAC. This issue is no longer res-integra in view of the judgment passed in **Lal Chand vs. Union of India (2009) 15 SCC 769**. It has been categorically held that the sale deeds reflecting a price lower than the amount offered by the LAC cannot be kept out of consideration by the court. Section 25 only debars the court from awarding an amount lesser than the amount offered. Thus, the RC cannot award an amount lesser than the amount determined by the LAC but there is no bar in considering the sale deeds of price lower than the amount offered by the LAC.

3.7 At this stage, it is considered appropriate to produce a tabulated compilation of the sale deeds produced by respective parties:-

Ex.	Number and Date of sale deed	Area sold	Sale consideration	Price per acre	Village
-----	------------------------------	-----------	--------------------	----------------	---------

RFA-1589-2019 (O&M)

and other connected cases

9

P-2	320 dated 18.04.2013	1A-7K- 15M	80,00,000	40,63,492/-	Anandpur Jalbera
P-3	1006 03.05.2005	36.66 square yards	1,23,000	1,62,38,953/-	Anandpur Jalbera
P-3	14308 22.03.2006	240 sq.yds	5,80,000/-	1,16,96,667/-	Jandli
P-4	5093 15.12.2006	24.44 sq.yds	1,26,000/-	2,49,52,537/-	Jandli
P-5	5344 28.12.2006	201.sq.ya rds	7,00,000/-	1,68,55,721	Jandli
P-6	1678 29.06.2007	200 sq.yards	10,00,000/-	2,42,00,000/-	Kanwla
P-7	8571 14.11.2005	208 sq.yards	4,27,000/-	99,35,962/-	Kanwla
R1	6977/ 30.03.2007	3K-4M	2,40,000/-	6,00,000/-	Anandpur Jalbera
R2	4050/ 14.12.2007	1 Acre	6,00,000/-	6,00,000/-	Anandpur Jalbera
R3	4369/ 03.01.2008	9 M	45,000/-	8,00,000	Anandpur Jalbera
R4	1373/ 30.06.2008	2K-1M	1,60,000/-	.6,24,390/-	Jandli
R1	3988/ 04.07.2005	04 K	3,00,000/-	6,00,000/-	Kanwli
R2	2927/ 03.07.2006	9A-6K- 14M	68,86,250/-	7,00,000/-	Kanwli
R3	200/ 13.04.2006	4K-17 M	4,25,000/-	7,01,031/-	Kanwla
R4	1549/ 16.05.2005	05K-07M	.4,02,000/-	.6,01,121/-	Kanwli

3.8 The second error of the RC is placing reliance on Ex.P3 sale deed bearing no. 1006 dated 03.05.2005 which is a tiny plot of land measuring 36.66 square yards, to assess the market value of an agricultural land. It is evident on a careful perusal of the sale deed no.1006 dated 03.05.2005 that a plot measuring (30 feet x 11 feet) located in Village Anandpur, Jalbera, has been sold. This is with respect to a tiny sized plot purchased for constructing a shop. This plot can

neither be used for residential purposes nor for agricultural purposes. Ordinarily, an acre of agricultural land consists of 4840 square yards. In other words, a tiny plot of 36.66 square yards is less than even 1% of an acre of land. While assessing the market value of the acquired land, the court is expected to look for the comparable sale instances. Similarly, the sale deed bearing no.320 is executed after a period of 7 years from the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Hence, the same is not relevant in the facts of the present case to assess the market value of the acquired land, particularly when the comparable sale deeds of contemporaneous period have been produced by the State of Haryana. For assessing the market value of the acquired land, the court is required to look for the comparable sale instances pertaining to the contemporaneous period. A bare perusal of the sale deeds bearing no.14308 (dated 23.03.2006), 5093 (dated 15.12.2006), 5344 (dated 28.12.2006), 1878 (dated 29.06.2007) and 8571 (dated 14.11.2005), it is evident that these sale deeds are with respect to either residential houses/plots or constructed shops. These are again with respect to tiny parcels of land as compared to the acquired land which is agricultural in nature. In other words, such parcels of land have not been sold for agricultural purposes, whereas, in the present case, it has been proved that the acquired land was being used for agricultural purposes and was not located near the residential or commercial area of any of the villages namely Jandli, Anandpur Jalbera or Kanwli. In fact, sale deeds bearing no.1678 (dated 29.06.2007) and 8571 (dated 14.11.2005) are with respect to tiny plots of land located in village Kanwla, which is a

different village. Hence, the aforesaid sale deeds produced in the file of award dated 25.01.2021 are also not relevant for assessing the market value of the acquired land, particularly when comparable sale deeds of contemporaneous period have been produced by the State. Ex.P1 is a copy of the RC's award dated 08.10.2016 passed with respect to the land acquired for development of residential and industrial area for Sector 23, Ambala City vide preliminary notification dated 28.02.2006. In '**State of Haryana vs. Baljinder Kaur.**' RFA No.484 of 2021 (supra), the judgment dated 28.02.2006 has already been reversed.

3.9 Similarly, Ex.P2 is copy of the judgment of the High Court in **State of Haryana vs. Gurdip Singh and another'** RFA-5605 of **2009** decided on 05.08.2015. This judgment pertains to assessment of the market value of the land measuring 47.09 acres in village Saunda acquired vide preliminary notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, dated 06.07.2007 for the construction of water works. There is no evidence to compare the location of the land acquired vide Ex.P2 with the acquired land in the present case. In **Chiman Lal Hargovinddass vs. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Poona and another, (1988) 3 SCC 751** the Supreme Court, while elaborating the factors which must be kept in mind while assessing the market value of the acquired land, has laid down as under:-

“4. The following factors must be etched on the mental screen:

(1) A reference under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act is not an appeal against the award and the court cannot take into account the material relied upon by the Land Acquisition Officer in his award unless the same material is produced and

proved before the court.

(2) So also the award of the Land Acquisition Officer is not to be treated as a judgment of the trial court open or exposed to challenge before the court hearing the reference. It is merely an offer made by the Land Acquisition Officer and the material utilised by him for making his valuation cannot be utilised by the court unless produced and proved before it. It is not the function of the court to sit in appeal against the award, approve or disapprove its reasoning, or correct its error or affirm, modify or reverse the conclusion reached by the Land Acquisition Officer, as if it were an appellate court.

(3) The court has to treat the reference as an original proceeding before it and determine the market value afresh on the basis of the material produced before it.

(4) The claimant is in the position of a plaintiff who has to show that the price offered for his land in the award is inadequate on the basis of the materials produced in the court. Of course the materials placed and proved by the other side can also be taken into account for this purpose.

(5) The market value of land under acquisition has to be determined as on the crucial date of publication of the notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act (dates of notifications under Sections 6 and 9 are irrelevant).

(6) The determination has to be made standing on the date line of valuation (date of publication of notification under Section 4) as if the valuer is a hypothetical purchaser willing to purchase land from the open market and is prepared to pay a reasonable price as on that day. It has also to be assumed that the vendor is willing to sell the land at a reasonable price.

(7) In doing so by the instances method, the court has to correlate the market value reflected in the most comparable instance which provides the index of market value.

(8) Only genuine instances have to be taken into account. (Sometimes instances are rigged up in anticipation of acquisition of land.)

(9) Even post-notification instances can be taken into account (1) if they are very proximate, (2) genuine and (3) the acquisition itself has not motivated the purchaser to pay a higher price on account of the resultant improvement in development prospects.

(10) The most comparable instances out of the genuine instances have to be identified on the

following considerations:

(i) proximity from time angle,

(ii) proximity from situation angle.

(11) Having identified the instances which provide the index of market value the price reflected therein may be taken as the norm and the market value of the land under acquisition may be deduced by making suitable adjustments for the plus and minus factors vis-à-vis land under acquisition by placing the two in juxtaposition.

(12) A balance-sheet of plus and minus factors may be drawn for this purpose and the relevant factors may be evaluated in terms of price variation as a prudent purchaser would do.

(13) The market value of the land under acquisition has thereafter to be deduced by loading the price reflected in the instance taken as norm for plus factors and unloading it for minus factors.

(14) The exercise indicated in clauses (11) to (13) has to be undertaken in a common sense manner as a prudent man of the world of business would do. We may illustrate some such illustrative (not exhaustive) factors:

Plus factors	Minus factors
1. smallness of size	1. largeness of area
2. proximity to a road	2. situation in the interior at a distance from the road
3. frontage on a road	3. narrow strip of land with very small frontage compared to depth
4. nearness to developed area	4. lower level requiring the depressed portion to be filled up
5. regular shape	5. remoteness from developed locality
6. level vis-à-vis land under acquisition	6. some special disadvantageous factor which would deter a purchaser
7. special value for an owner of an adjoining property to whom it may have some very special advantage	

(15) The evaluation of these factors of course depends on the facts of each case. There cannot be any hard and fast or rigid rule. Common sense is the best and most reliable guide. For instance, take the factor regarding the size. A building plot of land say 500 to 1000 sq. yds. cannot be compared with a large tract or block of land of say 10,000 sq. yds. or more. Firstly while a smaller plot is within the reach of many, a large block of land will have to be developed

by preparing a lay out, carving out roads, leaving open space, plotting out smaller plots, waiting for purchasers (meanwhile the invested money will be blocked up) and the hazards of an entrepreneur. The factor can be discounted by making a deduction by way of an allowance at an appropriate rate ranging approximately between 20 per cent to 50 per cent to account for land required to be set apart for carving out lands and plotting out small plots. The discounting will to some extent also depend on whether it is a rural area or urban area, whether building activity is picking up, and whether waiting period during which the capital of the entrepreneur would be locked up, will be longer or shorter and the attendant hazards.

(16) Every case must be dealt with on its own fact pattern bearing in mind all these factors as a prudent purchaser of land in which position the judge must place himself.

(17) These are general guidelines to be applied with understanding informed with common sense.”

3.10 It is evident that the RC has committed a material error in placing reliance on the sale deed bearing no. 1006, pertaining to 36.66 square yards of plot to determine the market value of acquired land which is agricultural in nature, particularly so when there are as many as 8 comparable sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana with respect to the various parcels of land located in villages Anandpur Jalbera, Jandli and Kanwli reflecting a price which is lower than the amount offered by the LAC, in these cases. These sale deeds are with respect to comparable parcels of land and have been executed during the contemporaneous period. The sale deed bearing No. 4050, dated 14.12.2007 with respect to 8 kanals of land in village Anandpur, Jalbera proves that the market value of the land was nearly Rs.6,00,000/- per acre. Even a smaller plot measuring 9 ½ marlas has been sold at the rate

of Rs.6,40,000/- per acre. Similarly, the sale deed bearing no.1373 (dated 30.06.2008) proves that the market value of the land in village Jandli was around Rs.6,25,000/- per acre. Even with respect to the land located in village Kanwli, sale deed no.2927 (dated 03.07.2006) has been produced to prove that the market value of the land was Rs.7,00,000/- per acre. In such circumstances, the reliance placed by the RC on the sale deed bearing no.1006 of a tiny plot of land measuring 36.66 square yards is incorrect and erroneous.

4.Decision:-

4.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the comparable sale deeds of contemporaneous period produced by the State of Haryana are found to be relevant/appropriate for assessing the market value of the acquired land in these cases. The LAC has already offered Rs.8,00,000/- per acre for the acquired land and none of the comparable sale instances proves that the price of the market value of the acquired land was more than Rs.8,00,000/-. Consequently, the appeals filed by the State of Haryana are allowed, whereas, that of the landowners are dismissed. Resultantly, the award passed by the RC is set aside, whereas, that of the LAC is upheld.

4.2 All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

01.11.2022
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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

RFA-1589-2019 (O&M)
and other connected cases

16

SR. NO.	CASE NO.	PARTIES DETAILS
1.	RFA-1589-2019	STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR V/S BALDEV SINGH AND ANR
2.	RFA-2062-2019	NAND KISHORE (SINCE DECEASED) THR. HIS LRS AND ORSV/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
3.	RFA-3416-2017	JASDEV SINGH AND ORS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
4.	RFA-2742-2017	RANDHIR SINGH ADVOCATE V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
5.	RFA-2744-2017	JAGIR SINGH ADVOCATE (DECEASED) THR. HIS LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA
6.	RFA-2743-2017	JAGIR SINGH ADVOCATE (DECEASED) THR. HIS LR & ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA
7.	RFA-3296-2017	JARNAIL SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA
8.	RFA-2084-2019	JASBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
9.	RFA-2088-2019	AMAR SINGH (NOW DECEASED) THR LRS AND ORS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
10.	RFA-2061-2019	RAM SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
11.	RFA-1599-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S AMAR SINGH (NOW DECEASED) THR. HIS LRS AND ORS
12.	RFA-1595-2019	STATE OF HARYANA V/S HARI KUMAR
13.	RFA-1598-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S HARDEV SINGH (NOW DECEASED) THR. HIS LRS AND ORS
14.	RFA-1590-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S SARABJIT SINGH AND ORS
15.	RFA-1606-2019	STATE OF HARYANA V/S JARNAIL SINGH AND ORS
16.	RFA-1594-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S KAPTAN SINGH AND ORS
17.	RFA-1600-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S SANT SINGH AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-1604-2019	STATE OF HARYANA V/S JAGIR SINGH ADVOCATE (DECEASED) TH. HIS LR AND ANR
19.	RFA-1592-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S ROOP SINGH AND OTHERS

**RFA-1589-2019 (O&M)
and other connected cases**

17

20.	RFA-1605-2019	STATE OF HARYANA V/S JAGIR SINGH ADVOCATE (DECEASED) THR. HIS LR
21.	RFA-2085-2019	SARABJIT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
22.	RFA-2086-2019	HARDEV SINGH (NOW DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
23.	RFA-2087-2019	KAPTAN SINGH AND OTHERS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
24.	RFA-2063-2019	SANT SINGH AND ORS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
25.	RFA-2064-2019	JAI SINGH AND ORS V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
26.	RFA-1603-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES S, HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S JAI SINGH AND ORS
27.	RFA-1596-2019	STATE OF HARYANA V/S DEVI LAL ALIAS RANDHIR SINGH AND ORS
28.	RFA-1602-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES S, HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S NAND KISHORE (NOW DECEASED) THR. HIS LRS AND OTHERS
29.	RFA-1591-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S JASBIR SINGH AND ORS
30.	RFA-1593-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S JASDEV SINGH AND OTHERS
31.	RFA-1597-2019	STATE OF HARYANA V/S SARWAN SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) NOW REPRESENTED BY HIS LRS AND ORS
32.	RFA-1601-2019	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA V/S RAM SINGH (NOW DECEASED) THR. HIS LRS AND ORS
33.	RFA-140-2018	SARWAN SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) NOW REPRESENTED BY HIS LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
34.	RFA-5167-2017	ROOR SINGH AND ORS. V/S THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR DIRECTORATE OF URBAN ESTATES HARYANA SECTOR 8 PANCHKULA
35.	RFA-23-2020	BALDEV SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
36.	RFA-5390-2017	DEVI LAL @ RANDHIR SINGH AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA

01.11.2022
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE