IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RFA-2069-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision:10.05.2022

State of Haryana and another
....Appellants

Versus

Daan Singh and others
..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Baldev Raj Mahajan, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana
and Ms. Vibha Tewari, AAG, Haryana,

Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
Mr. Navneet Singh, Advocate
Mr. Lekhraj Nandal, Advocate
Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate
Mr. Chander Shekhar Singhal, Advocate
for Mr. Vikrant Hooda, Advocate
for the landowners.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

A batch of 68 appeals, (details whereof are on the foot of the judgment) filed under Section 74 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Re-settlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as 'the RFCTLARR Act, 2013') assailing the correctness of a common award passed by the authority (Reference Court) (hereinafter referred to as 'RC') on 16.05.2019, shall stand disposed of. This batch of appeals relate to transitional period between the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') and the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. The notification under Section 4 and 6 were issued under the 1894 Act whereas the award by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as 'LAC') has been announced on 29.04.2014 under Section 24 (1)(a) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

At this stage, it would be appropriate to note the relevant particulars of the cases:-

29.09.2011	Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued proposing to acquire 69.27 acres of land located in Revenue Estates of Sarai Aurangabad, Kassar, Barakhdabad, Sankhol, and Bahadurgarh for development of Sector dividing road between Sector 5-15, 4-A-15, 4A-4, 4A-4B, 3-14, 3-3A and Sector 14 Bahadurgarh
28.09.2012	Declaration under Section 6 of the 1894 Act was published with respect to 47.11 acres of land.
29.04.2014	The LAC announced the award under Section 24 (1) (a) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 assessing the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.50,00,000/- per acre.
16.05.2019	The RC has assessed the marekt value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.1,02,20,000/- per acre. Micreteck Realtors Pvt. Ltd have been held entitled to market value at the rate of Rs.1,05,50,000/- per acre

The RFCTLARR Act, 2013 came into force on 002014. A Hybrid provision, in order to save the incomplete compulsory acquisitions of the land under the 1894 Act, has been incorporated in the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, which is extracted as under:-

> "24. Land acquisition process under Act No. 1 of 1894 shall be deemed to have lapsed in certain cases.–
> (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, in any case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894,—
> (a) where no award under section 11 of the said Land Acquisition Act has been made, then, all provisions of this Act relating to the determination of compensation shall apply; or
> (b) where an award under said section 11 has been made, then such proceedings shall continue under the provisions of the said Land Acquisition Act, as if the

said Act has not been repealed.
(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), in case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (1 of 1894), where an award under the said section 11 has been made five years or more prior to the commencement of this Act but the physical possession of the land has not been taken or the compensation has not been paid the said proceedings shall be deemed to have lapsed and the appropriate Government, if it so chooses, shall initiate the proceedings of such land acquisition afresh in accordance with the provisions of this Act:
Provided that where an award has been made and compensation in respect of a majority of land holdings has not been deposited in the account of the beneficiaries, then, all beneficiaries specified in the notification for acquisition under section 4 of the said Land Acquisition Act, shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act"

The provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 in the context of Section 24 (a) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 have been examined in detail in **State of Haryana vs. Rajbir and another RFA 309-2021** decided on 19.04.2022. While interpreting Section 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, it has been held as under:-

7. It is further provided that the Collector is required to adopt the method which assesses the highest market value out of the three options as provided under Clause(a), (b) and (c) of sub-section(1) of Section 26 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. The proviso to Section 26 (1) lays down that the market value shall be determined on the date on which the notification under Section 11 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 was issued. Explanation-1 to Section 26(1) provides that for determining the market value under Clause (b), the average sale price is required to be assessed by taking into account the sale deeds or the agreements to sell registered for similar type of area in the nearby village or nearby vicinity area during the period immediately preceding three years of the year in which the notification under Section 4(2) of the RFCTLARR

Act, 2013, for proposed acquisition of the land was issued. Thus, there is a substantial difference between the assessment under the old Act and under the new Act. In the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, the average sale price is calculated on the basis of the sale deeds or registered agreements to sell with respect to the period three years preceding the year in which such acquisition is proposed to be made. It is provided that the sale deeds of the year in which the notification under Section 4(2) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 has been issued shall be required to be excluded.

8. Similarly, Explanation-2 provides that while determining the average sale price, one half of the total number of the sale deeds or the agreements to sell in which the highest sale price has been reflected shall be taken into account. Explanation-3 stipulates that any price paid as compensation for the land acquired under the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 on an earlier occasion in the district shall not be taken into consideration. In other words, the previous assessment of the market value either by the Land Acquisition Collector or the Court with respect to different parcel of land by a separate notification shall be excluded from consideration while assessing the market value of the acquired land. Thereafter, Explanation-4 provides that if the Collector is of the opinion that any price paid or allegedly paid is not indicative of the prevailing market value, then, such sale deed(s) may be discarded for the purposes of calculating market value or in other words, excluded from being considered while calculating the average sale price. Further, sub-section(2) of Section 26 provides that after calculating the market value as per sub-section (1), the Collector shall multiply the same by a factor to be specified in the first schedule. Sub-section(3) further provides that where the Collector is unable to determine the market value of the acquired land under sub-section(1) or sub-section (2), then, the State Government shall specify the floor rate or minimum price per unit of the said land on the price calculated in the manner specified in sub-section (1) in respect of similar types of land situated in the immediately adjoining areas. Moreover, the various provisos to sub-section (3) provide the procedure where the acquiring body offers its shares to the owners. The last proviso to sub-section (3) provides that it shall be the duty of the appropriate government to ensure that the market *value determined for acquisition of any land or property of the educational institution established or administered by a religious or linguistic minority shall be such as would not restrict or abrogate the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.*

9. Section 28 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 lays down the various parameters to be kept in mind by the Collector while assessing the market value. Section 30 provides that the Collector after having assessed the compensation to be paid as per Section 26 (1 and 2) (including value of things attached to land or building), shall award a solatium amount equivalent to 100% of the compensation amount. It is significant to note that the amount of solatium is required to be calculated on the compensation amount which includes the determination made by the Collector in accordance with Section 26(1), (2) and (3) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, as the case may be. On a careful reading of Section 27, it is evident that the Collector is required to calculate the total amount of compensation including the market value of all the assets attached to the land. Sub-section (3) of Section 30 provides that the Collector shall, in every case, award an amount calculated at the rate of twelve per cent per annum on such market value for the period commencing on and from the date of publication of the notification for conducting Social Impact Assessment study of the land proposed to be acquired under sub-section (2) of section 4 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, till the date of the award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier. However, there is an anomaly in the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. Under Section 69, the aforesaid interest is required to be calculated from the date of notification under Section 11 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, whereas Section 30(3) provides that the interest/additional amount shall be calculated from the date of notification under Section 4(2) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

10. On a careful reading of Section 30 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, it is evident that a Statute has used the expression "the total compensation" determined by the Collector. Whereas Section 26(1) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 uses the expression 'the market value". Similarly, sub-Section (2) of Section 26 uses the expression "the market value calculated as per sub-section (1) shall be multiplied by a factor

> *to be specified in the First Schedule. The market value assessed by the Collector under sub-section (1) of Section 26 is different from the total compensation referred to in Section 30. Obviously, it would not only include the market value but also the amount which has been arrived at after multiplying the market value by a factor to be specified in the first schedule and the value of the things attached to the earth or building. On a careful reading of the first schedule, it is evident that the statute has used the expression "compensation". The components of the minimum compensation have been specified which include not only the market value of the land, factor and the value of the assets attached to the land or the building. This fact is further clear from Sr. No.5 in the first schedule which provides for solatium. It provides that the amount of solatium shall be equivalent to 100% of the market value of land mentioned against Sr.No.1 multiplied by the factor specified against Sr. No.2 or Sr. No.3 as the case may be. The solatium is required to be awarded after including the value of assets attached to the land or the building."*

This Court, also, had the occasion to examine the applicability of communication dated 26.10.2015 in the aforesaid case. After discussion, it was held that the communication dated 26.10.2015 does not fall within the meaning of Section 113 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 which enables the Central Government to remove difficulties and give such directions which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act. The relevant discussion on the aforesaid aspect is as under:-

> *"14. Section 23 of the 1894 Act specifically provides that the crucial date for assessment of the market value of the acquired land shall be the date of publication of notification under Section 4(1) of the 1894 Act. Further, the additional amount/benefit under sub-section(1-A) of Section 23 of the 1894 Act is, also, required to be calculated from the date of publication of notification under Section 4(1) till the date of award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the acquired land whichever is earlier. Section 24(1)(a) of the*

RFCTLARR Act, 2013 which specifically takes care of transitional period between the 1894 Act and the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, does not provide that the date of enforcement of the Act shall be construed as the date of issuance of notification under Section 4(2) or Section 11 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. Proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 26 provides that the date of determination of the market value shall be the date on which the notification has been issued under Section 11 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. Notification under Section 11 is a preliminary notification issued by the Government expressing its desire to acquire the land.

15. Further, Section 30(3) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, provides that the additional amount at the rate of 12% per annum on such market value is required to be calculated from the date of publication of notification for conducting Social Impact Assessment Study of the proposed land under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of RFCTLARR Act, 2013, till the date of award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land whichever is earlier. If the communication is considered as a direction issued by the Central Government in exercise of powers under Section 113 and the date of such assessment of the market value is taken as 002014, then, the same shall not only be in violation of Section 24 of the 1894 Act but also an infringement of the proviso to Section 26 (1) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. Clause 5 of Section 24 of the 1894 Act provides that any increase in the value of the acquired land which is likely to accrue from the use to which it might be put when acquired is to be ignored. In fact, by the aforesaid letter, the goalpost itself is sought to be changed. The date of assessment of the market value of the acquired land either under the 1894 Act or RFCTLARR Act, 2013 is sought to be overridden/surpassed. Both the Acts are based on the fundamental rule that the date of preliminary notification shall be the date for assessment of the market value. Once, there is no specific provision providing for assessment as on 002014, in the considered opinion of the Court the communication should be construed as arbitrary and ultra-vires to the provisions of both the Acts.

16. This matter can be examined from yet another perspective. By changing the goalpost to 002014, the exemplar sale deeds which have been executed and registered post the date of preliminary notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act which are, ordinarily excluded from consideration, shall be *required to be taken into account and thus, will go against the legislative approach, otherwise provided under both the Acts. In such a situation, it will become difficult for the courts to distinguish between bonafide sale deeds and the pretentious sale deeds which have been executed only to jack up the claim for compensation. Once, the factum of proposed acquisition of the land in the vicinity is in the knowledge of the residents of the area or landowners, then, the possibility of executing sale deeds with malafide intent for jacking up prices in the area would increase.*

Xxxx

19. This matter for the purpose of interpretation can be considered from yet another perspective. If the intention of the Legislature was to apply all the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, there was no necessity to enact a hybrid provision like Section 24(1)(a). In such case, it would have contained a provision that the pending or incomplete acquisition proceedings, shall lapse and the acquiring authority will start the proceedings afresh under the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. On a careful reading of Section 24(1)(a), it is evident that only the provisions relating to determination of compensation of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 have been made applicable while saving the notifications under Section 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act. The Legislature does not also provide that all the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, shall be applicable with respect to the incomplete proceeding under the 1894 Act.

20. As regards the argument of the learned counsel representing the landowners, it may be noted that the subject of acquisition and requisition of property is at entry No. 42 of the concurrent list of Seventh Schedule to The Constitution of India. Therefore, there cannot be any restriction on the State to enact law. In fact, the various State Government, have already enacted the laws, amending the various provisions of RFCTLARR Act, 2013. Section 107 cannot be read in a manner as suggested by the learned counsel representing the landowners. Section 107 does not prohibit the State Government from enacting its own law amending the RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

2 This court also does not find any substance in the arguments of the learned counsel that the communication dated 26.10.2015 is supplementary and does not supplant the Act. In the considered opinion of the court, the aforesaid letter is in conflict

> *with the provisions of the Act, consequently, if taken into account, it would result in supplanting the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, as to its implementation to the cases arising during the transition period.*
> *xxxxx*
> *30. While answering the question No.1, it is declared that under Section 24(1)(a) during the transitional period, the market value will have to be assessed on the date of publication of notification under Section 4(1) of the 1894 Act. Similarly, the additional amount under Section 30(3) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 shall be calculated from the date of publication of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act till the date of the award or date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier.*

Heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paper book alongwith the record, which was requisitioned. In the considered opinion of the Court, the matter is required to be remitted back to the learned RC on account of the following errors:-

a) The RC has committed an error in overlooking the sale deeds produced by Haryana Urban Development Authority-the beneficiary of the acquisition. The RC has refused to rely upon the sale deeds on the ground that these sale deeds reflect a market value less than the value assessed by the LAC. This matter is no longer res integra. The Supreme Court in **Lal Chand vs. Union of India (2009) 15 SCC 769**, while interpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act has held that the sale deeds reflecting the price lower than the amount assessed by the LAC cannot altogether be ignored. Consequently, such sale instances are required to be taken into account and the only prohibition is to award an amount lower than the amount assessed by the LAC.

b) The RC has relied upon sale exemplar Ex.P16 with respect to 49 kanals and 16 marlas of land which was sold on 29.07.2011 for a total sale consideration of Rs.6,56,73,150/-. The per acre price of the aforesaid land comes to Rs.1,05,50,000/-. The RC, assuming that the crucial date for assessment of the market value is 002014 while placing reliance on the communication dated 26.10.2015, granted an escalation at the rate of 12% per annum to arrive at a figure of Rs.1,36,29,556/-. Thereafter, the court proceeded to apply a deduction of 25% on the amount of Rs.1,36,29,556/- in order to arrive at a figure of Rs.1,02,20,000/-per acre (rounded off). The RC has committed two fundamental errors. The market value of the acquired land has been assessed post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. In fact, the amount has been assessed as on 002014, whereas, the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued on 29.09.201

c) The RC has relied upon a sale instance dated 29.07.2011, whereas, the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued on 29.09.201 As per explanation 1 of Section 26(1) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, the sale instances of the year in which such acquisition of the land is proposed to be made are required to be excluded.

d) Furthermore, the RC has not understood the correct interpretation and intent of the Parliament behind enacting Section 24 (1)(a) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, which provides that if the acquisition under the 1894 Act is not complete, Section 24 (1)(a) shall apply, thereby, resulting in the determination of compensation as per the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013. The RC has also failed to grant benefit to the landowners under Section 26 (2) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 which provides that the market value calculated as per sub-section 1 shall be multiplied by a factor to be specified in the First Schedule.

For all these reasons, award passed by the RC is set aside while remitting the matter back to decide afresh after granting an opportunity of leading further evidence, if prayed for. In RFA-2707-2019 the landowners have filed applications for permission to place on record two revenue layout plans in additional evidence. In the considered opinion of the Court, once the matter is being remitted back and an opportunity is being granted, to both the parties to lead evidence, the appellants can produce the evidence before the RC, which they intend to produce in this Court.

With these observations, the appeals are disposed of. The parties through their counsel are directed to appear before the RC on 305.2022.

10.05.2022 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
rekha **JUDGE**
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

Sr. No.	**Case No.**	**Party Name**
1.1.	**RFA-2069-2021 (Main case)**	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S DAAN SINGH AND OTHERS
2.1.	RFA-2070-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S SWAMI GANGA DASS
3.1.	RFA-2071-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S MAHABIR AND OTHERS
4.1.	RFA-2072-	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S GAMA

	2021	PROMOTERS PVT LTD AND ANOTHER
5.1.	RFA-2073-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S ANITA AND OTHERS
6.1.	RFA-2074-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S M/S DEVGAR ESTATE DEVELOPER PVT LTD. AND ANOTHER
7.1.	RFA-2075-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S JASPAL AND OTHERS
8.1.	RFA-2076-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S M/S SOURCE DEVELOPERS PVT LTD AND ANOTHER
9.1.	RFA-2077-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S RAMESH AND ORS
10.1.	RFA-2078-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S M/S GARG REALTORS PVT. LTD. AND ANOTHER
11.1.	RFA-2079-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S MANGE RAM AND OTHERS
12.1.	RFA-2080-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S MICROTEK REALTORS PVT LTD AND ANOTHER
13.1.	RFA-2081-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S JAI KISHAN AND OTHERS
14.1.	RFA-2082-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S MANKE RAM AND ORS
15.1.	RFA-2083-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S M/S MONARCH VILLAS PRIVATE LTD. AND ANOTHER
16.1.	RFA-2084-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S INDER KUMAR AND OTHERS
17.1.	RFA-2085-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S MOOL CHAND AND ORS
18.1.	RFA-2086-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S RAM KAWAR AND OTHERS
19.1.	RFA-2087-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S RAJENDER PRASAD ALIAS RAM NIWAS AND ANOTHER
20.1.	RFA-2088-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S BEST BUYS SERVICE PVT LTD AND ANOTHER
21.1.	RFA-2089-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S DHAN DEVI AND ORS
22.1.	RFA-2090-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S GEMINI REALTORS PVT LTD AND ANOTHER
23.1.	RFA-2091-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S JAIDEEP AND ANOTHER
24.1.	RFA-2092-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S PARDEEP KUMAR AND ANOTHER
25.1.	RFA-2093-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S PREM DUTT AND OTHERS
26.1.	RFA-2094-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S M/S GARG REALTORS PVT LTD AND ANOTHER
27.1.	RFA-2164-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S RAJENDER DUTT AND OTHERS

28.1.	RFA-2165-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S SHRI BHAGWAN AND ORS
29.1.	RFA-2173-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S BALWANT ALIAS SHRI BHAGWAN AND OTHERS
30.1.	RFA-2174-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S M/S DEVGAR ESTATE DEVELOPER PVT LTD AND ANOTHER
31.1.	RFA-2258-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS V/S RANBIR
32.1.	RFA-2261-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS V/S DEVENDER SINGH AND ORS
33.1.	RFA-2262-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS V/S ACHAL SINGH AND ORS
34.1.	RFA-2263-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS V/S UMRAO SINGH
35.1.	RFA-2264-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS V/S SATNAM SINGH
36.1.	RFA-2265-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS V/S DEEPAK AND ANOTHER
37.1.	RFA-2266-2021	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS VS. SMT. RAJWATI AND OTHERS
38.1.	RFA-2707-2019	SMT. RAJWATI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
39.1.	RFA-2978-2019	UMRAO SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
40.1.	RFA-2983-2019	ACHAL SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
41.1.	RFA-3029-2019	M/S GARG REALTORS PVT. LTD. V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
42.1.	RFA-3030-2019	M/S MONARCH VILLAS PRIVATE LTD. V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
43.1.	RFA-3031-2019	M/S GARG REALTORS PVT. LTD. V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
44.1.	RFA-3032-2019	M/S DEVGAR ESTATE DEVELOPER PVT. LTD. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
45.1.	RFA-3033-2019	M/S DEVGAR ESTATE DEVELOPER PVT. LTD. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
46.1.	RFA-3034-2019	M/S SOURCE DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD. V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
47.1.	RFA-3156-2019	DEVENDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
48.1.	RFA-3353-2019	RAM KANWAR AND OTHERS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
49.1.	RFA-3352-2019	TEKRAM AND OTHERS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
50.1.	RFA-3369-2019	BALWANT @ SHRI BHAGWAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

51.1.	RFA-3370-2019	MANGE RAM AND OTHERS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
52.1.	RFA-3371-2019	JAIDEEP V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
53.1.	RFA-3372-2019	INDER KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
54.1.	RFA-3373-2019	DEEPAK AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
55.1.	RFA-3374-2019	MANKE RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
56.1.	RFA-3375-2019	MAHABIR AND ORS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
57.1.	RFA-3376-2019	RAJENDER PRASAD @ RAM NIWAS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
58.1.	RFA-3377-2019	PREM DUTT AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
59.1.	RFA-3378-2019	RAJENDER DUTT (NOW DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
60.1.	RFA-3379-2019	SATNAM SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
61.1.	RFA-3380-2019	RANBIR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
62.1.	RFA-3381-2019	RAMESH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
63.1.	RFA-3492-2019	SHRI BHAGWAN (NOW DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
64.1.	RFA-3493-2019	MOOL CHAND AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
65.1.	RFA-3763-2019	DAAN SINGH AND OTHERS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
66.1.	RFA-2531-2021	DHAN DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
67.1.	RFA-3494-2019	JASPAL AND OTHERS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
68.	RFA-3887-2019	ANITA AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

10.05.2022 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
rekha **JUDGE**