In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 2016 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.03.2022

State of Haryana and Others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Ram Kumar and Another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Arun Beniwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
and Mr. Abhinash Jain, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Shailendra Jain, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Satyendra Chauhan, Advocate.

Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate.
Mr. Uday Goyal, Advocate,
Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate.
Mr. Satish Saini, Advocate.
Ms. Kannupriya, Advocate.
Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate.
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate.
Mr. Anurag Jain, Advocate.
Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate.
Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate.
Mr. Sanchit Punia, Advocate.
Mr. Rose Gupta, Advocate.
Mr. Himanshu Joshi, Advocate.
Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate
for the landowners.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This batch of 324 regular first appeals, details whereof are on the foot of the judgment, has been filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as "the 1894 Act") assailing the correctness of the award passed by the Reference Court on 29.01.2020. The relevant information concerning this bunch of appeals has been compiled in the tabulated form, which is as under:-

Sr. No.	Title	Details
(1)	Date of Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act.	29.08.2005
(2)	Date of Notification under Section 6 of the 1894 Act.	29.08.2006
(3)	Purpose of Acquisition.	Development of the residential and commercial Sector 3, 5 & 6 Part-II
(4)	Location, area and nature of the acquired land	Hansi – 229.13 Acres Dhana – 20.77 Acres Total – 249.90 Acres
(5)	Number and Date of the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector.	Award No.1 and 2 dated 03.08.2007
(6)	Amount assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector.	The LAC assessed the strip of the land, located upto the depth of 2 acres on Hisar-Delhi road @ ₹12,00,000/- per acre, whereas, the strip of land upto the depth of 2 acres, located on Jind byepass road, has been assessed at @ ₹10,00,000/- per acre. The remaining acquired land, which neither falls upto the depth of 2 acres, either from the Hisar-Delhi raod or the Jind byepass road, has been assessed @ ₹8,00,000/- per acre.
(7)	Date of the judgment of the Reference Court.	31.05.2014
(8)	Amount determined by the Reference Court	On 31.05.2014, the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as “the RC”) assessed the market value @ ₹1,000/- per square yard, which is equivalent to ₹48,20,000/- per acre.
(9)	Date and decision of the High Court	On 28.05.2016, the High Court re-assessed the amount of market value @ ₹4,173/- per square yard. The High Court, while increasing the market value @ ₹4,173/- per square yard, re-assessed the market value

Sr. No.	**Title**	**Details**
		by granting 15% cumulative increase for a period of 10 years, while taking into consideration the amount assessed by the Court in ***Ashrafi and Others v. State of Haryana and Others (2013) 5 SCC 527*** with respect to a previous acquisition in the area. The per acre market value works out to ₹2,01,97,320/-.
(10)	Date and decision of the Supreme Court	On 16.05.2018, the Supreme Court remanded the matter to the High Court by observing that - i) The Sale deeds should be considered over award/ judgment. ii) The sale deeds, which are produced are part of the acquired land. iii) The earlier acquisition in ***Ashrafi and Others v. State of Haryana and Others (2013) 5 SCC 527***, is of the year 1995 which is too for very small and commercial, should not be considered at least when the sale deeds are there.
(11)	Date and re-decision of the High Court, after remand from the Supreme Court.	Vide judgment dated 28.08.2019, the High Court, in Zile Singh-II v. State of Haryana (Regular First Appeal No. 7324 of 2014), remitted the appeals back to the RC for fresh adjudication.
(12)	Date of re-decision of the RC and the amount re-assessed, after remand	On 29.01.2020, the RC has relied upon Ex.P2 (the allotment letter dated 25.09.2007 for Administrative and Judicial Complex at a price of ₹3,200/- per square meter (inadvertently taken by the RC as ₹3,200/- per square yard) and applied a cut of 75% and thereafter,

Sr. No.	Title	Details
		assessed the amount @ ₹750/- per square square yard i.e. ₹36,30,000/- per acre.

1.2 Now, this batch of appeals has been filed by the landowners, with a prayer to enhance the market value of the acquired land, whereas, the State of Haryana has filed the appeals claiming that the judgment passed by the RC is erroneous.

1.3 The landowners claim that the acquired land is situated in a very busy business centre in the developing town of Hansi. It is claimed that hospitals, banks, grain market, schools, temples, the various colonies, namely Gandhi Colony and various commercial markets including Gandhi Market, Amar Market, Kath Mandi, Uttam Nagar, New Adda Market, Model Town Market, Devi Lal Market, Model Town, New Auto Market, Adarsh Nagar, New Subhash Nagar, Sector developed by the Haryana Urban Development Authority are situated in and around the acquired land which were developed much before the issuance of date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. It is also claimed that some part of the acquired land is situated within the municipal limits of the town of Hansi and the entire land, which is in a compact parcel, has the potential to be developed in any type of urban layout comprising of residential and commercial places. The acquired land abuts Delhi-Hisar National Highway-9 and therefore, it has an immense potential to be used for any purpose.

1.4 Per contra, the State has submitted that the LAC has correctly assessed the market value of the acquired land, while taking into consideration the various comparable sale deeds during the contemporaneous period.

2. ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the witness
1.	PW1 Sant Lal	Landowner
2.	PW2 Sushil Kumar	Clerk from the office of HUDA, Hisar
3.	PW3 Gokal son of Laxman Singh	Landowner
4.	PW4 Ved Pal	Registration Clerk
5.	PW5 Surender Kumar	Landowner
6.	PW6 R.K.Mehta	Draftsman
7.	PW7 Arjun son of Shri Surja Ram	Landowner
8.	PW8 Darshan Singh	Landowner
9.	PW9 Pawnesh Kumar	Clerk
10.	PW10 Sant Lal	Landowner
11.	PW11 Sanjiv Kumar	Landowner
12.	PW12 Sita Ram	Patwari
13.	PW13 Rajesh	Photographer
14.	PW14 Sadhu Ram	Draftsman
15.	PW15 Telu Ram Garg	Landowner
16.	PW16 Ramesh Chander	Assistant of the Office of Improvement Trust, Hansi
17.	PW17 Sudhir	Junior Telecom Officer of BSNL, Hansi
18.	PW18 Rajender Kumar	Clerk of MC Hansi
19.	PW19 Mukesh Kumar	Building Inspector
20.	PW20 Gautam Kumar	Patwari
21.	PW21 Surjit	Patwari

2.2 The landowners have also produced the documents apart from the sale deeds, which have been compiled in para 2.5 of the judgment. It is noted here that certain discrepancies were found in the tabulated information given in the judgment of the RC which have been corrected and the modified table is presented as under:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the document
1.	Ex.P1	Site plan of Hansi
2.	Ex.P2	Copy of letter no.17228 dated 25.09.2007.
3.	Ex.P3	Statement of accounts.
4.	Ex.P4	Copy of allotment letter no.16762 dated 21.10.2008.
5.	Ex.PW5/A	Copy of register of petition writer.
6.	Ex.P6	Copy of lease deed No. 3187 dated 18.12.1990
7.	Ex.P6	Copy of lease deed No. 1560 dated 15.11.1995
8.	Ex.PW6/A	Site plan.
9.	Ex.PW8/A	Application dated 21.03.2011
10.	Ex.PW9/A	Site plan
11.	Ex.PW11/A	Copy of award dated 09.06.1998
12.	Ex.PW11/B	Copy of site plan.
13.	Ex.PW12/1 to Ex.PW12/24	Photographs, CD and cash memo.
14.	Ex.PW13/I	Site plan
15.	Ex.PA and PB	Special power of attorney.
16.	Ex.PC	Partnership Deed
17.	Ex.PD	Site plan
18.	Ex.PW25 to Ex.P29	Record of Improvement Trust regarding auction
19.	Ex.P30 and 31	Site plan
20.	Ex.P32	Copy of judgment dated 11.10.2006
21.	Ex.P36	Copy of judgment dated 13.12.2005
22.	Ex.P.38	Copy of site plan.
23.	Ex.PW20/1	Jamabandi
24.	Ex.PW19/1	Jamabandi
25.	Ex.PW19/2	Mutation no.10907
26.	Ex.PX	Copy of order.
27.	Mark 9	Attested copy of licence fee.
28.	Mark PA	Allotment Letter

2.3 On the other hand, the State has examined the following witnesses:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the witness
1.	RW1 Sita Ram	Patwari.
2.	RW2 Mukesh Kumar	Ahalmad
3.	RW3 Surjit	Patwari

2.4 The State has produced the documentary evidence apart from the sale deed, which have been compiled in para 2.5 of the judgment. It is noted here that certain discrepancies were found in the tabulated information given in the judgment of the RC which have been corrected and the modified table is as under:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the document
1.	Ex.R2	Award No.1 dated 03.08.2007
2.	Ex.R3	List of sale-deeds.
3.	Ex.R23	Site plan.
4.	Ex.R35	Site plan.
5.	Ex.R36	List of sale deeds.
6.	Ex.R37	Site plan.
7.	Ex.R38	List of sale deeds.
8.	Ex.R39	Authority letter.
9.	Ex.R40	Copy of notification dated 29.08.2005
10.	Ex.R41	Copy of notification dated 28.08.2006.
11.	Ex.R42	Copy of Jamabandi.
12.	Ex.R43	Copy of fixation of land rates.
13.	Ex.RW2/A	Copy of reference.

2.5 Further, for the sake of brevity, a consolidated compilation of the sale deeds/sale exemplars with the relevant information, produced by the respective parties of villages, namely Hansi and Dhana Kalan, is tabulated as under:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos. in various files	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price (in ₹)	Price Per Acre (in ₹)
HANSI **(Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)**						
1.	P5	3188	18.12.1990	8 K -16 M	90,000	81,818
2.	PW4/A	1626	28.08.2003	4 K	20,00,000	40,00,000
3.	PW6/B	2627	21.09.2005	188.88 Sq. Yards	11,00,000	2,81,94,896
4.	PW6/C	5405	01.03.2006	81 Sq. Mtr.	1,75,000	87,50,000
5.	PW6/D	5676	28.03.2007	150.69 Sq. Yards	3,77,000	1,21,08,832
6.	PW6/E	1537	08.07.1994	24 Sq. Yards	61,000	1,23,01,666
7.	PW6/F	1730	07.11.1992	8 Sq. Yards	20,800	1,25,84,000
8.	PW6/G, P37	404	23.05.1992	2 M	54,000	43,20,000
9.	PW6/H	1626	28.08.2003	4 K	20,00,000	40,00,000

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos. in various files	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price (in ₹)	Price Per Acre (in ₹)
10.	PW6/I	5381	12.02.2008	2 A – 5 M	4,81,73,125	2,37,16,000
11.	P33	280	25.04.2006	200 Sq. yards	6,50,000	1,57,30,000
12.	P34	4706	26.02.2010	210 Sq. Yards	25,20,000	5,80,80,000
13.	P35	1537	08.07.1994	24 Sq. Yards	61,000	1,23,01,666
14.	P39	4871	07.03.2005	144 Sq. Yards	5,10,000	1,71,41,666
15.	P40	1671	30.06.2010	1A-3K-13M	1,82,88,400	1,25,58,557
16.	P41	1672	30.06.2010	1A-3K-10M	1,80,83,208	1,25,79,622
17.	P42	1807	22.07.2005	120 Sq. yards	3,90,000	1,57,30,000
18.	P43	1799	22.07.2005	57 Sq. Yards	5,52,300	4,68,97,052
19.	P44	2553	16.09.2005	188.88 Sq.Yards	13,90,000	3,56,18,382
20.	P45	2850	11.10.2005	150 Sq. Yards	3,50,000	1,12,93,333
21.	P46	2023	10.08.2005	138.3 Sq. yards	4,64,000	1,62,38,322
22.	P47	283	29.04.2005	280 Sq. yards	9,65,000	1,66,80,714
23.	P48	1741	19.07.2005	126 Sq. Mtr.	6,90,000	2,21,68,674
24.	P49	5676	28.03.2007	150.69 Sq. yards	3,77,000	1,21,08,832
25.	R8	4019	18.12.2008	1 A -1K – 2M	11,37,500	10,00,000
26.	R10	5095	14.02.2006	4 K – 13 M	1,57,000	2,70,107
27.	R11	5117	15.02.2006	59K – 8M	20,25,000	2,72,727
28.	R12	5164	16.02.2006	7K – 18M	2,68,000	2,71,392
29.	R13	1193	14.06.2005	2K	1,00,000	4,00,000
30.	R14	2123	30.07.2004	2K	81,000	3,24,000
31.	R15	4137	30.12.2005	2K-11M	1,60,000	5,01,960
32.	R16	4831	31.01.2006	4K-17M	3,05,000	5,03,092
33.	R17	1951	13.07.2006	2A-5K-5M	13,29,000	5,00,329
34.	R18	2714	06.09.2006	2K-4M	2,20,000	8,00,000
35.	R19	1192	14.06.2005	2K	1,00,000	4,00,000
36.	R20	1194	14.06.2005	2K – 8M	1,20,000	4,00,000
37.	R21	4689	21.02.2005	2K -17M	2,85,000	8,00,000
38.	R22	2531	15.09.2005	4K	2,50,000	5,00,000
39.	R24	3615	24.03.2000	3K	71500	1,90,666
40.	R25	394	18.05.2000	1K – 5 ½ M	40,000	2,50,980
41.	R26	52	05.04.2002	2K	55,000	2,20,000
42.	R27	1900	04.10.2002	4K	1,60,000	3,20,000
43.	R28	1634	29.06.2004	3K	1,20,000	3,20,000
44.	R29	4391	27.01.2005	28K	14,00,000	4,00,000
45.	R30	56	08.04.2005	300 Sq. yards	75,000	12,10,000
46.	R31	226	26.04.2005	200 Sq. Yards	50,000	12,10,000
47.	R32	363	05.05.2005	200 Sq. Yards	50,000	12,10,000
48.	R33	865	30.05.2005	1K – 14M	85,000	4,00,000
49.	R34	1163	14.06.2005	1K – 14M	87,500	4,11,764
50.	R35	1808	22.07.2005	19K – 13M	12,30,000	5,00,763
DHANA KALAN **(Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)**						
51.	R4	4259	06.01.2006	3 K – 13 M	1,28,000	2,80,547

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos. in various files	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price (in ₹)	Price Per Acre (in ₹)
52.	R5	4261	06.01.2006	3 K – 7 M	1,17,500	2,80,597
53.	R6	4480	24.12.2007	1 K	62,500	5,00,000
54.	R7	287	25.04.2008	3 K – 14 M	3,01,000	6,50,810
55.	R9	4260	06.01.2006	1 A -7K- 19 M	5,60,000	2,80,877

2.6 In order to understand the information compiled in above-noted table, it is appropriate to explain the meanings of the words/phrases used, while referring to the unit of land, which are 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		

2.7 During the consolidation of the land holdings in the villages/revenue estate under the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act 1953, the total land of the village is divided into Rectangles which consists of 25 acres of land. Each Rectangle is assigned a numerical number starting from 1. As per the practice, which is uniformly followed, Rectangle No.1 is assigned to North Eastern Corner of the village and the assigned number increase in a strip of land having depth, equivalent to 5 acres towards South Eastern boundary of the village, then the assigned numbers keep increasing from the South Eastern side of the village towards the North Eastern side, again, in a strip of land having depth of 5 acres abutting the previous strip of land towards the Western side of the previous strip of land. (In other words, the assigned Rectangle numbers increase in spiral manner similar to the numbers assigned to each box in the game of Snakes and Ladder.)

3. <u>ARGUMENTS ADDRESSED BY THE RESPECTIVE COUNSELS</u>

3.1 Heard the learned counsel representing the parties, at length and with their able assistance, carefully perused the judgment passed by the RC as well as the record of the case produced by the parties, before the RC in the lead case. The learned counsel representing the respective parties have also filed the synopsis with brief notes of their submissions. Mr. Aashish Gupta, Advocate, represents the subsequent allottees of the plots, who had filed the civil appeal in the Supreme Court, challenging the judgment of the High Court passed on 28.05.2016 in the previous round. He has also filed, written synopsis. The learned senior counsel has also filed a rebuttal to the synopsis filed by the learned counsel representing the State of Haryana.

3.2 Mr. Shailender Jain, Senior Advocate, the lead counsel, has submitted that the Court should not rely upon the sale instances, produced by the State, which are relating to the period 12 months prior to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. While elaborating, he has submitted that the intention of the legislature is apparent from perusal of Section 26 of the Right to Fair Compensation, Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as "the 2013 Act"). Next, he submitted that the sale instances, produced by the State, should be declared to be undervalued in order to save the payment of stamp duty. While drawing the attention of the Court to the sale instance (Ex.PW.4/A) dated 28.08.2003 with respect to the land measuring 4 kanals for an amount of ₹20,00,000/-, he contended that the aforesaid parcel of land is located on the Delhi-Hisar Road and therefore, the Court, while assessing the market value of the acquired land, should rely upon the same after granting escalation for a period of 2 years on the sale price of ₹40,00,000/- per acre. He also relied upon the sale instances (Ex.P12, Ex.P6/C, Ex.P33 and Ex.PW.6/D) in support of his submissions.

3.3 Per contra, the learned State counsel, while drawing the attention of the Court to layout plan (Ex.R37) has submitted that the State has produced as many as 17 sale deeds of the acquired land. He has submitted that various parcels of reasonable size, which can be used for agricultural purpose from the acquired land have, consistently, been sold at a price ranging ₹4,00,000/- to ₹5,00,000/- per acre only. He has further submitted that the sale instances, produced by the landowners, should not be relied upon as these are either with respect to plots in the developed commercial market or developed residential colony or sector. He further submitted that the market value of a large chunk of acquired land cannot be determined on the basis of such a small plot.

4. <u>DISCUSSION BY THIS COURT</u>

4.1 Before this Court proceeds further, it is considered appropriate to first of all analyze the reasons, recorded by the RC in the impugned judgment. The first reason, assigned by the RC, is to the effect that the sale deeds, produced by the State, are undervalued in order to save payment on the stamp duty. Secondly, the RC has observed that the acquired land measuring 12.73 acres was allotted to the Department of Revenue, vide allotment letter dated 25.09.2007, @ ₹3,200/- per square meter (inadvertently recorded by by the RC as ₹3,200/- per square yard) and then, a deduction of 75% has been applied to arrive at a figure of ₹800/- per square yard. Thereafter, the RC, while referring to the sale deeds (Ex.PW.6/B to Ex.PW6/I and Ex.P33 to Ex.P35, Ex.P37, Ex.P39 to Ex.P49) and the sale deeds (Ex.R4 to Ex.R22 and Ex.R24 to Ex.R35), assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹750/- per square yard. In fact, the entire discussion of the RC on this aspect is in para 21, which is extracted as under:-

> *"21. Ex.P-2 is the letter dated 25.09.2007, which proves that the office of HUDA sold 12.73 acres of land of Sector 5 Hansi to Revenue Department for construction of Administrative and Judicial Complex at the rate of Rs.3200/- per square yard. The land 12.73 acres is admittedly a part of the acquired land. The contention of the petitioners is that the rate of acquired land must be atleast assessed at the rate of Rs.3200/- per acre as the part of the acquired land has been transferred by the department of HUDA at this rate in year 2007. This contention of the learned advocate for petitioners has also mot much water to hold. It is evident that there is a gap of two years in the transfer of land by the department of HUDA to the Revenue*

Department. Further, the land transferred by HUDA was developed by the department before its transfer which increased its value substantially. Therefore, the petitioners cannot claim the rate of acquired land at the rate of Rs.3200/- because the acquired land was not developed by HUDA at the time of its acquisition but the same was developed at the time of its transfer to the Revenue Department. But, the letter, Ex.P-2, is certainly important to assess the market value of the acquired land in the year 2005. Since, the portion of the acquired land was transferred by HUDA to the revenue department at the rate of Rs.3200/- per square yard, it is evident that the market value of the land must not be less than 25% of Rs.3200/- per square yard before development, which comes to Rs.800/- per square yard. Since the land measuring 12.73 acres was transferred in year 2007, the market rate of the acquired land had to be somewhat below the rate of Rs.800/- per square yard in year 2005. Therefore, keeping in view the letter, Ex.P-2, the sale deeds, Ex.PW6/B to Ex.PW6/I and Ex.P-33 to Ex.P-35, Ex.P-37 and Ex.P-39 to Ex.P-49 relied upon by the petitioners and sale deeds Ex.R-4 to Ex.R-22 and Ex.R-24 to Ex.R-35, the market value of the acquired land is fixed as Rs.750/- per square yard on the date of notification under section 4 of the Act, that is, 29.08.2005".

4.2 It would be noted here that the learned counsel representing the parties have failed to draw the attention of the Court to any evidence to prove that the sale deeds, produced by the State of Haryana, were undervalued in order to save the stamp duty. The Court, on the basis of certain observations made in the ***Haryana State Industrial Development Corporation Limited v. Pransukh and Another 2010 (11) SCC 175*** has returned a finding that the transactions, involving the transfer of the immovable properties, are usually undervalued with a view to avoid payment of the requisite stamp duty and the registration charges. In the considered view of the Court, such observations are not borne out from the record. It has come in evidence that the claimants/appellants are the same landowners, who have purchased the properties through the various sale instances, produced by them. Ex.R14 is a sale instance of 2 kanals of land, purchased on 30.07.2004 by Zille Singh. He has filed the application under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, bearing LAC No. 257/08.09.2008. Similarly, Ex.R15 is a sale instance of 2 kanals and 11 marlas of land, purchased vide sale deed dated 30.12.2005 by Suresh Chander son of Zille Singh, who has filed the application (LAC No. 189/09.12.2012). Similarly, Ex.R17 is a sale instance dated 30.07.2006, with respect to the land measuring 21 kanals and 5 marlas, purchased by Smt.Maya wife of Bharat Singh, who has filed the application (LAC No. 425/25.11.2008). Ex.R18 is a sale instance dated 06.09.2006 with respect to the land measuring 2 kanals and 4 marlas, purchased by Vijay Kumar, who is the applicant in LAC No.129/20.09.2010. Similar is the position with regard to the sale deeds (Ex.R21, Ex.R22, Ex.R24, Ex.R25, Ex.R26, Ex.R28, Ex.R29, Ex.R30, Ex.R31, Ex.R32 and Ex.R34). It is significant to note that Shashi kant has purchased a large chunk of land vide sale deeds (Ex.R29, Ex.R33 and Ex.R35). These landowners have not led any evidence to prove that the sale deeds were undervalued with a view to save the requisite stamp duty and the registration charges. In such circumstances, the observations made by the RC are erroneous.

4.3 The RC has also erred in relying upon the allotment letter dated 25.09.2007 with respect to the developed land measuring 12.73 acres. The

RC, after noticing that it is with respect to the developed area and the allotment is post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, has relied upon the same by applying 75% deduction. It would be noted here that the RC has overlooked Section 24(5) of the 1894 Act, which specifically provides that any increase in the value of the acquired land likely to accrue from the use to which it would be put after acquisition is required to be ignored in determining the compensation. Section 24 of the 1894 Act is extracted as under:-

> *"24. Matters to be neglected in determining compensation.- But the Court shall not take into consideration -*
>
> *first, the degree of urgency which has led to the acquisition;*
>
> *secondly, any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired;*
>
> *thirdly, any damage sustained by him which, if caused by a private person, would not render such person liable to a suit;*
>
> *fourthly, any damage which is likely to be caused to the land a cquired, after the date of the publication of the declaration under section 6, by or in consequence of the use to which it will be put;*
>
> *fifthly, any increase to the value of the land acquired likely to accrue from the use to which it will be put when acquired;*
>
> *sixthly, any increase to the value of the other land of the person interested likely to accrue from the use to which the land acquired will be put;*
>
> *seventhly, any outlay or improvements on, or disposal of the land acquired, commenced, made or effected without the sanction of the Collector after the date of the publication of the [notification under section 4, sub -section (1)]; or*
>
> *eighthly, any increase to the value of the land on account of its being put to any use, which is forbidden by law or opposed to*

public policy".

4.4 It is, thus, evident that the RC has overlooked the statutory provision.

4.5 Furthermore, it is also evident from para 21, which has been reproduced above, that the RC, without disclosing the reasons as to how it arrived at a market value of ₹750/- per square yard, has referred to the various sale instances without analyzing as to whether these sale instances are comparable or not. Hence, it becomes important for the Appellate Court to examine all the sale instances.

4.6 Ex.R2 is an allotment letter of the land measuring 12.73 acres, allotted by the Haryana Urban Development Authority to the Department of Revenue, Haryana, for developing the Judicial and Administrative Complex. This sale instance should not be considered in view of Clause (5) of Section 24 of the 1894 Act particularly when the comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period with respect to the acquired land itself, have been produced. This allotment is also more than 2 years subsequent to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act.

4.7 The sale instances Ex.PW.6/B to Ex.PW.6/I are with respect to very small plots of land, which are ordinarily used either for shops or residential purposes. The sale instance (Ex.PW.4/A = Ex.PW.6/H) is with respect to the land measuring 4 kanals, with respect to the land situated in rectangle No. 481, 491 and 496, which is at a distance of 4 Kms. for the acquired land. On a careful examination of the layout plan (Ex.R37), produced by the State, it is evident that the acquired land is not from rectangle No. 481, 491 and 496. The undivided share of the joint land had been sold. From a bare look at the layout plan (Ex.P13/A), it is evident that the aforesaid parcel of the land is located at a distance of 4 Kms. from the acquired land, which has been confirmed by the learned counsel representing the State of Haryana. Although, the aforesaid parcel of the land is also located on the Delhi-Hisar road, however, keeping in view the distance as also the aforesaid sale instance is not considered appropriate. It is relevant to note here that a parcel of land sold through sale instance dated 22.07.2005 (Ex.R35), with respect to the land measuring 19 kanals and 13 marlas, is also located on the Delhi-Hisar road. It forms part of the acquired land. Similar is the position with regard to the sale instances Ex.R30, Ex.R31, Ex.R32 & Ex.R34. In these circumstances, it would not be appropriate to rely upon the sale instance (Ex.PW.4/A). Furthermore, the sale instances Ex.P33 to Ex.P39 are with respect to very small plots of land which can ordinarily be used for commercial or residential purpose. The sale instance (Ex.P37) & Ex.PW6/G is one and the same sale instance. No doubt, the sale instance Ex.P40 and Ex.P41 are with respect to medium sized parcels of the land measuring 11 kanals and 13 marlas and 11 kanals and 10 marlas, respectively. But both these sale instances are of 30.06.2010 which is four years after the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The sale instances Ex.P42 to Ex.P49 are again with respect to very small plots, which are ordinarily used only for residential or commercial purposes. The RC also referred to the sale instances Ex.R4 to Ex.R12 and Ex.R24 to Ex.R35, but has failed to discuss the same.

4.8 On a careful examination of the layout plan Ex.R37, it is evident that the State of Haryana has produced as many as 17 sale deeds namely Ex.R14, Ex.R15, Ex.R17, Ex.R18, Ex.R21, Ex.R22 and Ex.R24 to Ex.R35 with respect to the various parcels of the land, which forms part of the acquired land. The cumulative total area sold through all these sale deeds come to 100 kanals and 12½ marlas of the land.. It is also evident that the sale instance (Ex.R29) is with respect to the land measuring 3½ acres which has been purchased by Shashi Kant, who is one of the claimant, @ ₹4,00,000/- per acre on 07.01.2005. The preliminary notification was issued on 29.08.2005 i.e. within a period of 7 months from the sale deed. As per the assessment by the RC, Shashi kant has been held entitled to the market value of the acquired land @ ₹36,30,000/- per acre along with all the statutory benefits. Similar is the position with regard to the sale instance dated 22.07.2005 (Ex.R35) wherein the same Shashi Kant purchased the land measuring 19 kanals and 13 marlas, which is approximately 2½ acres @ ₹5,00,763/- per acre. The notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act has been issued after a period of one month only. Similarly, the sale instance dated 13.07.2006 (Ex.R17) is 11 months post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. This sale instance is with respect to the land measuring 21 kanals and 5 marlas (more than 2½ acre of land) which has been sold @ ₹5,00,329/- per acre. Thus, it can be safely concluded that even after the issuance of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, the prices of the land in the area did not increase exponentially.

4.9 Now, the question is as to whether the Court should adjudicate the market value of the acquired land by relying upon the preferred sale instances of the acquired land itself, which have been produced or on the basis of assumptions. These sale instances are between the private persons. The State of Haryana or Haryana Urban Development Authority (hereinafter referred to as "the HUDA") is not party to the same. Hence there is no reason to discard these sale instances of the acquired land.

4.10 Now, let us analyze the arguments advanced by the learned counsel representing the landowners. The first argument of the learned senior counsel does not have any substance because the 2013 Act came to be enforced w.e.f. 01.01.2014. In the present case, the market value of the acquired land is being assessed as on 29.08.2005. The acquisition is under the 1894 Act. The attention of the Court has not been drawn to any provision, which provides for applicability of the 2013 Act to the acquisitions made for assessment of the market value under the 1894 Act, except Section 24 of the 2013 Act, which is not applicable in the present case. Further, the argument of the learned senior counsel is fallacious. The Explanation (I) of Section 26 of the 2013 Act only provides that while determining the average sale price, the Court is required to take into consideration the sale deeds executed immediately, within the preceding three years from the year in which such acquisition of the land is notified to be made.

4.11 As regards the second argument of the learned senior counsel with regard to the usual practice of undervaluation of the sale deed, in order to save payment of the requisite stamp duty and the registration charges, this Court has carefully read the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in

Pransukh's case *(surpa)*. No doubt, the Supreme Court has observed that this is a normal practice. However, such an observation, with greatest respect, cannot be construed as *the ratio decidendi* of the judgment. In that case, the parties had led the evidence to prove the market value on the basis of a sale deed between the two corporate entities, where the sale consideration was paid through bank transactions. After noticing that there is a huge variation, the Court made such observations. In the present case, the State has produced in evidence as many as 17 different sale deeds with respect to various parcels of land which form part of the acquired land reflecting a consistent price. Hence, it is not considered appropriate to ignore all the sale deeds, produced by the State.

4.12 The next argument of the learned senior counsel is with reference to the sale instance (Ex.P12 and Ex.P28) with respect to the developed plot measuring 192 square meters, sold by the Improvement Trust, vide sale deed dated 16.02.2006. This is with respect to the residential plot No.48, situated in Model Town Market, Hansi and hence, it is not considered appropriate to rely upon for assessing the market value of a large chunk of the undeveloped acquired land. Similarly, the sale instance dated 01.03.2006 (Ex.PW.6/C) is also post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act with respect to the plot measuring 96.876 square yards in a developed Sector 6, Part-II, HUDA Colony, Hansi. The sale instance (Ex.P33 dated 24.04.2006) is another sale instance, which is claimed to be a part of the acquired land in the written submissions, filed by the learned counsel representing the landowners. The aforesaid sale instance is not only post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, but also with respect to the plot measuring 200 square yards from rectangle No. 508, khasra No. 5/2/2/2/1 and 9/2. From the careful perusal of the layout plan (Ex.P38), it is evident that this plot is not a part of the acquired land. In fact, it is located on the other side of the main road. Furthermore, ordinarily the area of a rectangle is 121000 square yards. The sale instance is with respect to an undivided share measuring 200 square yards. Hence, it would not be appropriate to rely upon the same. The aforesaid plot, purchased by Radhey Shyam son of Shyam Lal, is not only post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, but even Radhey Shyam has not appeared in evidence to prove that the plot in question has been acquired. Hence, the sale instance (Ex.P33) is not considered appropriate to be relied upon to assess the market value of the undeveloped acquired land measuring 249.90 acres.

4.13 The last argument of the learned senior counsel representing the land landowners is with reference to the sale instance dated 20.03.2007 (Ex.PW.6/D and Ex.P49), which is not only post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, but also with respect to a plot measuring 150 square yards located in developed Sector 6, Part-II, HUDA Colony, Hansi. Hence, it is not considered appropriate to assess the market value of the undeveloped land.

4.14 The landowners have produced as many as seven layout plans, in support of their case. In Ex.P9/A, the various parcels of land sold through some of the sale deeds produced by the landowners have been depicted. It is evident that none of the sale deeds, as depicted in Ex.P9/A, is with respect to the acquired land. The landowners, apart from producing the various sale deeds, have also produced allotment letter issued by the Haryana Urban

Development Authority in the year 2008, while allotting 15 acres of land to the Haryana State Agricultural Marketing Board @₹2,246/-. No doubt, the plot measuring 15 acres is allotted out of the acquired land, but this is after a period of two years from the date of acquisition when the area has been developed by the Haryana Urban Development Authority. Therefore, this allotment letter cannot be relied upon to assess the market value of the undeveloped land. Similarly, the landowners have also relied upon the auction proceedings of various plots held by the Hansi Improvement Trust with respect to the shops Ex.P25 to Ex.P29. These auction sales are with respect to shops and therefore, these cannot be relied upon. Apart from that, the landowners have also relied upon the judgment passed by the High Court in Civil Writ Petition No. 5290 of 1993, which was decided on 11.10.2006. The High Court assessed the market value @ ₹150/- per square yard with respect to acquisition of the land started acquired vide notification under Section 34 of the Town Improvement Act on 24.03.1993. Hence, this assessment by the High Court is with respect to a very old acquisition. Therefore, it cannot be relied upon particularly in view of the comparable sale deeds of contemporaneous period with respect to the acquired land. The next award relied upon by the learned counsel representing the landowners is Ex.P36, passed by the RC on 13.12.2005 with respect to the acquisition of land initiated on 18.03.1992 by issuing notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The market value of the acquired land measuring 21.06 acres was assessed @ ₹700/- per square yard. Even this assessment made by the RC with respect to a different parcel of land acquired through a separate notification cannot be relied upon, particularly when the sale instances of the acquired land, itself, are available.

4.15 The learned senior counsel relied upon the judgment of the Delhi High Court in ***Ujjal Singh v. Union of India and Others 1979(2) ILR Delhi 129*** with respect to the acquisition of the land in Karkardooma, Delhi. The Court, after noticing that the sale instances of the small plots have been produced, held that such sale instances cannot be relied upon because this may be a misleading guide. However, the sale instances of the small plots are not to be entirely disregarded, because they can afford some help in the task of assessing the market value. Neither, the aforesaid judgment lays down that in all eventualities, the sale instances of the small plots, which are not comparable, must be relied upon nor it is held that while ignoring the comparable sale instances during contemporaneous period, the sale instances of small plots of the developed areas should given preference. The second judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel is in ***Onkarnal (Dead) through LRs v. State of Haryana and Another 2005(2) RCR (Civil) 348***. In the aforesaid case, the question was with regard to reliance on the price fetched in open auction sale. In that case, the land was sought to be acquired for setting up a housing colony in Hisar. The Court has held that the auction sale two months prior to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act can be relied upon in the absence of other evidence. The next judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel is in ***Balbir Singh and Another v. Haryana State Through Collector, Hisar and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 249 of 2000, decided on 16.11.2012)***. In this case also, the acquired land was located in Hisar. The case, the Court assessed the market value in the peculiar facts of that case.

4.16 The next judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel is in ***Executive Engineer, Karnataka Housing Board v. Land Acquisition Officer, Gadag and Others (2011) 2 SCC 246***. In the aforesaid case, the comparison was made between the auction sale and open market sale for the purpose of assessing the market value of the land and the Court held that where an open auction sale is also comparable sale transaction, the Court can rely upon the price disclosed, with caution.

4.17 The next judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel is in ***Major General Kapil Mehra and Others v. Union of India and Another (2015) 5 SCC 262***. The Delhi Development Authority acquired the land for development of Vasant Kunj Residential Scheme. The preliminary notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued in the year 1983. The Court held that the general rule is that the sale price of comparable sale deed with respect to the auction sale will not be relied upon to assess the market value of the acquired land. In the considered opinion of the Court, the aforesaid judgment also does not help the landowners.

4.18 The next judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel is in ***Chiman Lal Hargovinddass v. Special Land Officer, Poona AIR 1988 Supreme Court 1652***. While enlisting the factors to be taken into consideration, in assessing the market value, the Court held that even post notification sale instances can be taken into consideration in certain circumstances.

4.19 Further, the judgment relied upon by the RC is in ***Pransukh's case*** *(supra)*. In the aforesaid judgment, the Supreme Court, in para 22, made an observation with regard to the usual practice of undervaluation of the sale instances. The Court gave preference to the sale instance between the two corporate entities while making an observation that there is normal practice of undervaluing the sale consideration in order to save the payment of stamp duty and the registration charges. With highest respect, the aforesaid observations can be considered to be *ratio decidendi*.

4.20 In the end, the learned counsel representing the landowners rely upon the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in ***Ashrafi's case*** *(supra)*. The learned counsel has submitted that the Supreme Court assessed the market value @ ₹1,342/- per square yard with respect to a different acquisition of nearby land, which is located 300 yards from the acquired land. It would be noted here that once the sale instance of the acquired land itself are available, it would not be appropriate to rely upon the assessment of the market value of the acquired land, made by the Court, which is based the conclusion drawn on the basis of evidence. In the facts of the case, the Supreme Court in ***Ashrafi's case*** *(supra)*, while deciding a large batch of appeals arising from compulsory acquisition of the land in five different States, assessed the market value. In the considered opinion of the Court, with highest respect, the judgment passed in ***Ashrafi's case*** *(supra)* does not declare that the market value of the land in the revenue estate of Hansi is ₹1,342/- per square yard. This is an assessment, made by the Court on the basis of the evidence produced. Hence, this judgment does not advance the case of the appellant.

4.21 Further, the learned senior counsel representing the landowners has filed rebuttal submissions to the written submissions filed by the learned counsel representing the State as well as the allottee. Apart from reiterating the arguments, which have already been addressed, the learned senior counsel relied upon ***Raghubans Narayan Singh v. The U.P. Government through Collector of Bijnor AIR 1967 Supreme Court 465***, to contend that all potential possibilities of use of land, in all possible ways, is to be examined while assessing the market value. In this judgment, the Supreme Court, after examining the facts of the case, found that the High Court resorted to a method of evaluation on the basis of annual crop value which was not adequate. Hence, the judgment of the High Court was set aside while restoring to the assessment made by the RC. In that context, the Court observed that all the possible potentialities of use of the acquired land is required to be taken into consideration.

4.22 The next judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel is in ***State of Kerala v. Mariamma Abraham and Another AIR 1969 Kerala 265***. In this case, the acquisition was made under the Travancore-Cochin Land Acquisition Act, 1089 for the acquisition of 1.272 acre of double crop wet and 54.54 acres of dry land in Kottayam district.The Division Bench of the High Court decided the case on the peculiar facts pertaining to that case.

4.23 The next judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel representing the landowners is ***Karnataka Housing Board v. Land Acquisition Officer, Gadag and Others (2011) 2 SCC 246***. In the aforesaid case, the Supreme Court, while considering the facts of that case held that open market sale is to be preferred in order to obviate the possibility of the auction sale transaction being higher due to the element of competition. As already noticed, in the present case, the aforesaid issue does not arise.

4.24 The last judgment relied upon by the learned senior counsel representing the landowners is a judgment from the Division Bench of the Himachal Pradesh High Court in ***Land Acquisition Collector v. Sukhdev Singh AIR 1995 Himachal Pradesh 150***. In the facts of the aforesaid case, after extensively discussing the law propounded in ***Chiman Lal Hargobind Dass's case*** *(supra)*, dismissed the appeals. Thus, as already noticed, the judgments relied upon by the learned counsel representing the landowners do not advance the case of the landowners.

4.25 It would be noted here that the Supreme Court, while deciding a batch of appeals in ***Manoj Kumar etc. Vs. State of Haryana and Others (2018) 13 SCC 96***, has expounded that outright reliance on a previous assessment made by the Court with respect to the acquisition of the land through different notifications, located nearby, is not appropriate and such judgment is only a piece of evidence which should be evaluated by the Court before relying upon the assessment made in the same. This issue is no longer res-integra. Recently, in ***Manoj Kumar's case*** *(supra)*, the Supreme Court has held that while assessing the market value, the Court is required to evaluate the various factors which goes to impact such a determination depending upon the peculiar facts governing each case. There cannot be any hard or fast rule for assessment of the market value. Common sense is the best and most reliable guide. While denouncing the practice of the courts to place an outright reliance on the previous judgments, the Supreme Court has declared that the decision cannot be applied *ipso facto* to the facts of the subsequent cases while neglecting the other evidence. The Court has further warned of the ill effects of such an approach. The relevant discussion is in paras 11 to 14, which are extracted as under:-

"11. In our opinion, the High Court could not have placed an outright reliance on Swaran Singh case [Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044] , 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 case [Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044] 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 bona fide 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.

12. 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. The 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.

13. The awards and judgment in the cases of others not being inter parties are not binding as precedents. Recently, we have seen the trend of the courts to follow them blindly probably under the misconception of the concept of equality and fair treatment. The courts are being swayed away and this approach in the absence of and similar nature and situation of land is causing more injustice and tantamount to giving equal treatment in the case of unequals. As per situation of a village, nature of land, its value differ from distance to distance, even two to three kilometre distance may also make the material difference in value. Land abutting highway may fetch higher value but not land situated in interior villages.

14. The previous awards/judgments are the only piece of evidence on a par with comparative sale transactions. The similarity of the land covered by previous judgment/award is required to be proved like any other comparative exemplar. In case previous award/judgment is based on exemplar, which is not similar or acceptable, previous award/judgment of court cannot be said to be binding. Such determination has to be outrightly rejected. In case some mistake has been done in awarding compensation, it cannot be followed; on the ground *of parity an illegality cannot be perpetuated. Such award/judgment would be wholly irrelevant."*

4.26 In the considered view of this Court, the determination of the market value of the land on the basis of comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous period is the most preferred and logical method to arrive at a fair and true market value. While deciding such cases, the Court is required to adopt a holistic approach. The Court is expected to assess a just and appropriate market value on the basis of the evidence produced. In such circumstances, comparable sale deeds offer a good solution to the problem. They are considered as the best evidence to prove a fact being in the nature of direct evidence and help the Court to assess the market value more accurately and realistically. Once comparable sale deeds of the contemporaneous period are available to guide the court, it is not safe to rely upon a previous judicial assessment of the market value while ignoring the sale deeds which reflect the most accurate market value of the property on which a seller voluntarily offers to sell the property on receipt of the amount from a willing purchaser. Unless the correctness of the price, reflected in these sale deeds, is disputed on any ground duly proved, the court can safely rely upon the same for assessing the market value. If there are a large number of comparable sale deeds of the contemporaneous period, the Court can, with reasonable certainty, assess the market value while relying upon such sale instances.

5. <u>DECISION</u>

5.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the considered view that the landowners have failed to produce any convincing evidence to prove that the price assessed by the LAC was erroneous. Consequently, the appeals, filed by the State of Haryana, are allowed, whereas the appeals, filed by the landowners, are dismissed. The assessment made by the LAC, in two different awards, is upheld.

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

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

March 04, 2022
"DK"

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

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
1.	RFA-1190-2021	RAMDASS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-1231-2021	SMT. MEENA	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
3.	RFA-1993-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SUNITA AND ANOTHER
4.	RFA-1513-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM CHANDER AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-1146-2021	PARTAP SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
6.	RFA-1484-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RANBIR SINGH AND ANOTHER
7.	RFA-1171-2021	SMT. CHANDER KALA AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
8.	RFA-1888-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RATTAN SINGH AND ANOTHER
9.	RFA-2347-2021	CHAMELI AND OTHERS	HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ANR
10.	RFA-1104-2021	BALWANT	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
11.	RFA-2447-2021	SMT. SAVITRI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
12.	RFA-1157-2021	RAJMAL AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
13.	RFA-1183-2021	DR. TELU RAM	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
14.	RFA-1531-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJMAL AND OTHERS

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
15.	RFA-1115-2021	SMT. SHARBATI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
16.	RFA-1182-2021	SMT. SANTOSH KUMARI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
17.	RFA-1456-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	YASH PAL AND ANOTHER
18.	RFA-1486-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM KISHAN AND ANOTHER
19.	RFA-1109-2021	PARTAP SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-1839-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JASWANT RAI AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-1506-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT MURTI DEVI AND ANOTHER
22.	RFA-1117-2021	RAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
23.	RFA-1514-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	VARINDER AND ANOTHER
24.	RFA-1942-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ANIL KUMAR AND ANOTHER
25.	RFA-1502-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUBE SINGH AND ANOTHER
26.	RFA-1167-2021	RAM CHANDER AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-1173-2021	AMARJEET AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-1980-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MAYA AND ANOTHER
29.	RFA-1535-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHIV KUMAR AND OTHERS
30.	RFA-1123-2021	ZILE SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
31.	RFA-1510-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ATAM PARKASH AND ANOTHER
32.	RFA-1500-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM NIWAS AND OTHERS
33.	RFA-1996-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	KHUSHI RAM AND OTHERS
34.	RFA-1160-2021	HOSHIAR SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
35.	RFA-2380-2021	LILA DECEASED THROUGH LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
36.	RFA-1933-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	RAM SARUP AND OTHERS
37.	RFA-1475-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJESH KUMAR AND ANOTHER
38.	RFA-2001-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHIV KUMAR ALIAS SHEEL KUMAR AND ANOTHER
39.	RFA-2343-2021	TARA CHAND SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
		LRS	
40.	RFA-1527-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARTAP SINGH
41.	RFA-1986-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ZILE SINGH
42.	RFA-1232-2021	JOGENDER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
43.	RFA-2169-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT SURINDER ALIAS SIDHU AND ANOTHER
44.	RFA-2690-2021	PIRTHI SINGH DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
45.	RFA-2004-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. MEENA AND ANOTHER
46.	RFA-1508-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. RAJBALA
47.	RFA-1469-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT SANTOSH KUMARI AND OTHERS
48.	RFA-1116-2021	RAM KISHAN	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
49.	RFA-2005-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. RAJNI GARG AND ANOTHER
50.	RFA-1958-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ZILE SINGH
51.	RFA-1964-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT RAJNI GARG AND ANOTHER
52.	RFA-1503-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT. CHANDRO DEVI AND OTHERS
53.	RFA-2099-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BANARSI DASS AND ANOTHER
54.	RFA-1457-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PREM LATA AND ANOTHER
55.	RFA-1458-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH CHANDER
56.	RFA-2096-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HAKAM SINGH AND OTHERS
57.	RFA-1164-2021	KAMLA DEVI AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
58.	RFA-1479-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALDEV SINGH AND OTHERS
59.	RFA-1499-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KRISHAN AND ANOTHER
60.	RFA-1442-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM CHANDER AND ANOTHER
61.	RFA-1153-2021	RAM KISHAN	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
62.	RFA-1166-2021	RAJNI GARG	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
63.	RFA-1155-2021	JAI KUMAR	HUDA AND ANR
64.	RFA-1530-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SAVITRI DEVI AND OTHERS

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
65.	RFA-1110-2021	SURESH CHANDER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
66.	RFA-1920-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HOSHIAR SINGH AND OTHERS
67.	RFA-1454-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DALBIR SINGH AND ANOTHER
68.	RFA-1103-2021	RATTAN SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
69.	RFA-1136-2021	RAM NIWAS AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
70.	RFA-1133-2021	CHAMELI DEVI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
71.	RFA-2008-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DINESH KUMAR
72.	RFA-1967-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PIRTHI SINGH THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
73.	RFA-1496-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SATYAVIR JAIN AND OTHERS
74.	RFA-1598-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BANWARI SUBCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS. AND ANOTHER
75.	RFA-1968-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DARSHAN SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND ANOTHER
76.	RFA-1941-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PIRTHI AND OTHERS
77.	RFA-1974-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	SMT. CHAMELI AND OTHERS
78.	RFA-2366-2021	BHAG CHAND	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
79.	RFA-1159-2021	SMT. SAVITRI DEVI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
80.	RFA-1805-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SINGH
81.	RFA-1928-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT SUMITRA DEVI AND ANOTHER
82.	RFA-1156-2021	RADHEY SHAM AND OTHERS	HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ANOTHER
83.	RFA-1461-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DR. TELU RAM AND ANOTHER
84.	RFA-2344-2021	RAM SARUP AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
85.	RFA-1148-2021	RAM PAYARI THROUGH HER LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
86.	RFA-1534-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM PAYARI SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HER LRS AND ANOTHER
87.	RFA-1443-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT SAVITRI AND ANOTHER
88.	RFA-2600-2021	NAROTTAM AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
			OTHERS
89.	RFA-1108-2021	DINESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
90.	RFA-1235-2021	SAJJAN KUMAR AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
91.	RFA-1134-2021	SURYAKANT	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
92.	RFA-1856-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JOGENDER
93.	RFA-2443-2021	SATYAVIR JAIN AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
94.	RFA-1489-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KAILASH AND ANOTHER
95.	RFA-2007-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	VIJENDER SINGH AND ANOTHER
96.	RFA-1802-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AJIT KUMAR AND OTHERS
97.	RFA-2345-2021	ARJUN SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS MANPATI DEVI	HARYANA URBAND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (HUDA) AND ANOTHER
98.	RFA-1200-2021	SURESHI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
99.	RFA-1122-2021	SURESH CHANDER AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
100.	RFA-2009-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT KANTA DEVI AND ANOTHER
101.	RFA-2450-2021	PARTAP SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
102.	RFA-1521-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHARDA DEVI
103.	RFA-1465-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARTAP SINGH AND OTHERS
104.	RFA-1970-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NAVNEET MEHARIA AND ANOTHER
105.	RFA-1965-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KISHAN LAL AND OTHERS
106.	RFA-1493-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JINTENDER KUMAR
107.	RFA-1972-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SAROJ BALA AND ANOTHER
108.	RFA-2641-2021	RESHMA (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HER LRS AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
109.	RFA-1141-2021	AJIT SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
110.	RFA-1139-2021	SHARDA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
111.	RFA-1191-2021	RAM CHANDER THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
112.	RFA-2671-2021	HAWA SINGH AND ORS	HRYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
			AUTHORITY AND ORS
113.	RFA-1169-2021	KHUSHI RAM AND OTHERS	HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ANOTHER
114.	RFA-2106-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURYAKANT AND ANOTHER
115.	RFA-1179-2021	LAJWANTI SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
116.	RFA-1948-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUSHIL KUMAR AND ANOTHER
117.	RFA-1452-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT RAJ BALA AND ANOTHER
118.	RFA-1240-2021	RAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
119.	RFA-2452-2021	KRISHAN	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
120.	RFA-1501-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SHARBATI
121.	RFA-1120-2021	HAKAM SINGH AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
122.	RFA-2006-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. ANITA DEVI AND ANOTHER
123.	RFA-1515-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ZORA SINGH AND ANOTHER
124.	RFA-177-2022	SHER SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
125.	RFA-1467-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	ARJUN SINGH AND ANOTHER
126.	RFA-1520-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SATBIR SINGH
127.	RFA-1814-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHARBATI AND ANOTHER
128.	RFA-1809-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LAJWANTI AND ANOTHER
129.	RFA-2454-2021	SMT. MURTI DEVI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
130.	RFA-1229-2021	HARNAM SINGH (DECEASED) THR. LRS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
131.	RFA-1989-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KHUSHI RAM AND OTHERS
132.	RFA-1482-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SAVITA DEVI AND OTHERS
133.	RFA-1446-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JAI SINGH AND ANOTHER
134.	RFA-1112-2021	SHREE RAM SHARNAM SOCIETY (REGISTERED)	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
135.	RFA-2115-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BHAG CHAND AND ANOTHER
136.	RFA-2407-2021	SHER SINGH AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
			OTHERS
137.	RFA-1172-2021	SHANTI DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
138.	RFA-2153-2021	VED PARKASH (SINCE DECEASED)THROUGH HIS LRS AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
139.	RFA-1213-2021	DEVENDER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
140.	RFA-1236-2021	SURESH KUMAR AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
141.	RFA-1518-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUBHASH AND ANOTHER
142.	RFA-1234-2021	AJIT KUMAR AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
143.	RFA-1897-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH KUMAR AND OTHERS
144.	RFA-1492-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BALWANT
145.	RFA-1497-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	JAI KUMAR AND ANOTHER
146.	RFA-1464-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ANUP KUMAR AND OTHERS
147.	RFA-1798-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM KISHAN
148.	RFA-1998-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DIAMOND CYCLE P LTD THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR AND ANOTHER
149.	RFA-1230-2021	RAJ KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
150.	RFA-2113-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. BHIRAWAN BAI AND OTHERS
151.	RFA-2429-2021	NIRMALA	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
152.	RFA-2441-2021	MANOHAR LAL DECEASED THROUGH LR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
153.	RFA-1462-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. NIRMAL AND ANOTHER
154.	RFA-1512-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHANTI DEVI
155.	RFA-1158-2021	FATEH SINGH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
156.	RFA-1971-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAMESH KUMAR AND ANOTHER
157.	RFA-2458-2021	SATBIR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
158.	RFA-1495-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NAROTTAM AND ANOTHER
159.	RFA-1878-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AJIT SINGH AND ANOTHER
160.	RFA-15-2022	RATI RAM	HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
			AUTHORITY AND ANOTHER
161.	RFA-1176-2021	VARINDER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
162.	RFA-2102-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SINGH AND ANOTHER
163.	RFA-2107-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DR. TELU RAM AND ANOTHER
164.	RFA-1478-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHIV KUMAR AND ANOTHER
165.	RFA-1144-2021	SMT. SARITA	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
166.	RFA-1114-2021	RAM SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
167.	RFA-2442-2021	SMT. BITA	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
168.	RFA-1476-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	ISHWAR SINGH AND ANOTHER
169.	RFA-1435-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJENDER KUMAR AND OTHERS
170.	RFA-1138-2021	RAM SARUP (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
171.	RFA-1995-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMIT AND OTHERS
172.	RFA-1938-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MEWA AND OTHERS
173.	RFA-2632-2021	MEWA AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
174.	RFA-1107-2021	GOBIND RAM (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRs	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
175.	RFA-1178-2021	SAMMAT SINGH	HUDA NOW HSVP AND ANOTHER
176.	RFA-2116-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. PROMILA DHAWAN
177.	RFA-1833-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BHAGWAN DASS AND OTHERS
178.	RFA-1162-2021	YASH PAL AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
179.	RFA-1447-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH KUMAR AND OTHER
180.	RFA-1477-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SARUP AND OTHERS
181.	RFA-1186-2021	RUGHNATH ALIAS RAGHUNATH AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
182.	RFA-1494-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJESH AND ANOTHER
183.	RFA-1118-2021	RAM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
184.	RFA-1963-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT RAJPTI AND ANOTHER

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
185.	RFA-1935-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MANOHAR LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND ANOTHER
186.	RFA-1524-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUBHASH CHANDER AND ANOTHER
187.	RFA-1850-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	VIJAY KUMAR AND OTHERS
188.	RFA-1459-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJ KUMAR AND ANOTHER
189.	RFA-1137-2021	PARKASH @ OM PARKASH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
190.	RFA-1485-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SARUP AND OTHERS
191.	RFA-1449-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM NIWAS AND OTHERS
192.	RFA-1504-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SINGH AND OTHERS
193.	RFA-1124-2021	BHANI AND ANOTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
194.	RFA-1522-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SHANTI AND OTHERS
195.	RFA-1498-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	FATEH SINGH AND OTHERS
196.	RFA-1165-2021	ISHWAR SINGH AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
197.	RFA-1450-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MUKESH KUMAR AND OTHERS
198.	RFA-2656-2021	SUBHASH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
199.	RFA-1150-2021	ANIL KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
200.	RFA-2110-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARTAP SINGH AND ANOTHER
201.	RFA-1149-2021	KRISHAN KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
202.	RFA-1954-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAN SINGH AND OTHERS
203.	RFA-1468-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT USHA KIRAN AND ANOTHER
204.	RFA-1526-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	MAHABIR AND OTHERS
205.	RFA-1451-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JAIBIR SINGH AND ANOTHER
206.	RFA-1448-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUNIL KUMAR AND ANOTHER
207.	RFA-1175-2021	SMT. SHANTI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
208.	RFA-2445-2021	RAJINDER	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
209.	RFA-1140-2021	ANUP KUMAR AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
210.	RFA-1528-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHREE RAM SHARNAM SOCIETY
211.	RFA-1143-2021	SMT. CHANDRO DEVI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
212.	RFA-1145-2021	SUSHIL KUMAR AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
213.	RFA-9084-2014	SHIV KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
214.	RFA-1953-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM SARUP SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS
215.	RFA-1127-2021	ANUP KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
216.	RFA-1233-2021	SUNIL KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
217.	RFA-1174-2021	MEWA AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
218.	RFA-1532-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SATBIR AND ANOTHER
219.	RFA-1170-2021	SURESH KUMAR AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
220.	RFA-1864-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DEVENDER
221.	RFA-1491-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH CHANDER AND OTHERS
222.	RFA-1168-2021	BIHARI AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
223.	RFA-1825-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT SUNEHARI AND ANOTHER
224.	RFA-1820-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	TARA CHAND AND ANOTHER
225.	RFA-1455-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT RAJBALA AND ANOTHER
226.	RFA-2384-2021	KULDEEP SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
227.	RFA-1196-2021	MADAN LAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
228.	RFA-1105-2021	AMAR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
229.	RFA-1529-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT MANJU
230.	RFA-1163-2021	SMT. SURINDER ALIAS SINDHU	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
231.	RFA-125-2022	SURESH CHANDER AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
232.	RFA-1488-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SAJJAN KUMAR AND OTHERS
233.	RFA-1185-2021	ZORA SINGH AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
234.	RFA-2150-2021	MUKESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
			OTHERS
235.	RFA-1608-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	NARAIN DASS AND ANOTHER
236.	RFA-1113-2021	SUKH RAM	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS OTHERS
237.	RFA-1505-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LICHMI DEVI AND OTHERS
238.	RFA-2338-2021	RAM SARUP SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS	HUDA (NOW HSVP) AND ORS
239.	RFA-19-2022	PARKASH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
240.	RFA-1180-2021	SUBHASH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
241.	RFA-1135-2021	LICHMI DEVI (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HER LRS AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
242.	RFA-1981-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	RATI RAM AND ANOTHER
243.	RFA-1969-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SWAMI AMARANAND CHELA SHAKRANAND CHALA PARMANAND
244.	RFA-1106-2021	JASWANT RAI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
245.	RFA-1480-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUDHIR AND ANOTHER
246.	RFA-1511-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	JUG LAL AND ANOTHER
247.	RFA-1470-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT MURTI DEVI AND OTHERS
248.	RFA-1490-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KRISHAN KUMAR SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND ANOTHER
249.	RFA-1126-2021	SATBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
250.	RFA-1936-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BIHARI AND OTHERS
251.	RFA-2100-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHIV KUMAR AND ANOTHER
252.	RFA-1437-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SARITA AND ANOTHER
253.	RFA-1154-2021	KISHAN AND OTHERS	HUDA NOW HSVP AND OTHERS
254.	RFA-1177-2021	MUKESH KUMAR	HUDA NOW HSVP AND ORS
255.	RFA-1960-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GOBIND RAM DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS
256.	RFA-1441-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT BITA AND ANOTHER
257.	RFA-1151-2021	BHAGWAN DASS AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
258.	RFA-1487-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND	SMT. RAJ DULARI AND

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
		ANOTHER	ANOTHER
259.	RFA-1481-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHANTI NIKETAN COOPERATIVE HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY LIMITED AND ANOTHER
260.	RFA-2536-2021	SHARBATI DEVI SINCE DECESED THROUGH HER LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
261.	RFA-1111-2021	RAM SARUP (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
262.	RFA-1147-2021	DHAN SINGH ALIAS CHAN SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
263.	RFA-1507-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. CHANDER KALA AND OTHERS
264.	RFA-2459-2021	RAM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
265.	RFA-1957-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SUKH RAM AND ANOTHER
266.	RFA-1181-2021	SMT. SAROJ BALA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
267.	RFA-1128-2021	KIRNA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR
268.	RFA-2010-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	MAMAN RAM AND ANOTHER
269.	RFA-151-2022	KRISHAN KUMAR DECEASED THROUGH LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
270.	RFA-1952-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH CHANDER AND ANOTHER
271.	RFA-1194-2021	RAMBIR AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
272.	RFA-1432-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAMBIR AND ANOTHER
273.	RFA-1956-2021	STATE OF HARYANA	MADAN LAL AND ANOTHER
274.	RFA-1129-2021	NARAIN DASS THRIUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
275.	RFA-1533-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJENDER KUMAR AND ANOTHER
276.	RFA-1516-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. USHA KIRAN AND ANOTHER
277.	RFA-1977-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH KUMAR AND OTHERS
278.	RFA-1202-2021	SMT. MANJU	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
279.	RFA-1463-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KAMLA DEVI AND OTHERS
280.	RFA-2602-2021	MAYA	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
281.	RFA-1121-2021	THE SHANTI NIKETAN COOPERATIVE HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
		LIMITED HANSI	
282.	RFA-1509-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. SAJNI DEVI AND ANOTHER
283.	RFA-1924-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	IMARTI DEVI AND ANOTHER
284.	RFA-18-2022	MAHABIR AND ANR	HUDA AND ANR
285.	RFA-1119-2021	GOBIND RAM (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
286.	RFA-1130-2021	SMT. USHA KIRAN	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
287.	RFA-1466-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	DALEL SINGH ALIAS ZILE SINGH AND OTHERS
288.	RFA-2460-2021	RAMESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
289.	RFA-1517-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	VIDHYA PARKESH AND ORS.
290.	RFA-2003-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SMT. NIRMALA AND ANOTHER
291.	RFA-1187-2021	DARSHAN SINGH DECEASED THROUGH LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
292.	RFA-1142-2021	RADHEY SHAM	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
293.	RFA-1131-2021	PIRTHI	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
294.	RFA-2444-2021	SAVITA DEVI AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
295.	RFA-2446-2021	SUBE SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
296.	RFA-1959-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KIRAN DEVI
297.	RFA-2406-2021	CHATTAR SINGH AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
298.	RFA-1161-2021	KUSHI RAM AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
299.	RFA-1125-2021	RAM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
300.	RFA-1994-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	BISHNA
301.	RFA-1523-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KRISHAN KUMAR
302.	RFA-1444-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	CHANDER BHAN AND OTHERS
303.	RFA-1519-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SURESH KUMAR AND ANOTHER
304.	RFA-1525-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	KULDEEP SINGH AND OTHERS
305.	RFA-1206-2021	DALBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
306.	RFA-1943-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAJINDER AND ANOTHER

Sr.No.	Case No.	Name of the petitioners	Name of the Respondent(s)
307.	RFA-387-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	LILA AND ANOTHER
308.	RFA-374-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	PARKASH ALIAS OM PARKASH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LEGAL HEIRS AND ANOTHER
309.	RFA-388-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	GOBIND RAM DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS
310.	RFA-386-2022	STATE OF HARYANA	HAWA SINGH AND OTHERS
311.	RFA-375-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RADHEY SHAM AND ANOTHER
312.	RFA-385-2022	STATE OF HARYANA	SAMMAT SINGH AND ANOTHER
313.	RFA-382-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAMDASS
314.	RFA-395-2022	STATE OF HARYANA	RADHEY SHAM AND OTHERS
315.	RFA-383-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	MEWA AND ANOTHER
316.	RFA-377-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SADHU RAM (DECEASED) THR. LRS. AND OTHERS
317.	RFA-379-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	SHER SINGH DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
318.	RFA-391-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	HARNAM SINGH NOW DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND ANOTHER
319.	RFA-378-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	VED PARKASH AND ANOTHER
320.	RFA-2631-2021	RAM KUMAR @ RAM KAWAR (DECEASED) THR. LRS. AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
321.	RFA-2505-2021	BALDEV AND OTHERS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
322.	RFA-1927-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	RAM KUMAR ALIAS RAM KAWAR SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS
323.	RFA-1453-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER	AMARJEET AND OTHERS

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge