

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)
and other connected cases

1

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

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.09.2022
Reserved on: 19.09.2022

Sat Parkash and othersAppellants
Versus

State of Haryana and others ..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Sumeet Goel , Senior Advocate,
with Mr. A. N. Vaid, Advocate,
Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate,
Mrs. Neeraj, Advocate,
with Mr. Abhinav, Advocate, &
Mr. Madan Pal, Advocate,
Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate,
Mr. J.P. Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Nayandeep Rana, Advocate,
Ms. Vaishali Kamboj, Advocate,
Mr. M. K. Taya, Advocate,
Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate,
Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubber, Advocate,
Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate,
Ms. Monika Gupta, Advocate,
Mr. Rajinder Goel, Advocate,
Mr. J. K. Goel, Advocate,
Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate,
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Varinder Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Akshay Jindal, Advocate, for appellant (s) -landowners

Mr. Ajay Chauhan, Advocate, for
Mr. Diwan S. Adlakha, Advocate,
Mr. J. S. Virk, Advocate,
Mr. Manoj Kumar Taya,
Ms. Monika Gupta, Advocate,
Mr. Dhruv Kaushik, Advocate, for
Mr. Arun Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Nayandeep Rana, Advocate,
Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate, for the respondents

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate,
Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate,

Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate, for HSIIDC

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. Introduction and background:-

1.1 While praying for modification of the market value assessed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as ‘the RC’), the landowners as well as the Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructural Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as ‘HSIIDC’) have come up in appeal. This batch of appeals (detail whereof is at the foot of the judgment) has been filed challenging the correctness of the two different awards passed by the RC. The notification under Section 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the 1894 Act’) and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as ‘LAC’) are common, however, the RC by two different awards, has assessed identical market value of the acquired land. Learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that this batch of appeals can conveniently be disposed of by a common judgment. In fact, the RC, after consolidating all the reference petitions, in two batches has decided the lead case while delivering the same judgment in the remaining cases.

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

Sr.No	Date	Particulars
1.	11.07.2006	Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was published proposing to acquire land for expansion of Industrial Estate, Sector 3 Karnal
2.	16.07.2007	Declaration under Section 6 was published.
3.	23.06.2009	Vide award no.2 dated 23.06.2009 the LAC, Karnal offered to pay Rs.15,00,000/- per acre for the land upto depth of 2 acres from the GT Road whereas

		the remaining land which is beyond the depth of 2 acres from the GT Road was assessed at Rs.12,00,000/- per acre alongwith solatium at the rate of 30% and an additional amount at the rate of 12% per annum.
4.	27.08.2014	The RC has assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.40,20,884/- per acre
5.	10.02.2015	In the second award passed by the RC, while deciding 21 reference petitions, filed under Section 18 and 30 of the 1894 Act, the RC has assessed the same amount.

1.3 In order to project the potentiality of the acquired land, the landowners have claimed that though the acquired land was being used for agricultural purpose but its potentiality for being used for industrial, commercial and residential purposes was very high. No other parcel of land, except the acquired land located on Bajida Road is available. The acquired land is located just opposite to Sector 3 and the New Grain Market on the GT Road, Karnal. The State of Haryana has acquired land in Village Phusgarh, for setting up Sector 32 and 33 Karnal, which is at a distance from the acquired land in this case. Vide award dated 23.04.2000, the LAC has offered to pay at the rate of Rs.439/- per square yard alongwith all the statutory benefits. There are various residential and commercial establishments and educational institutions located in the vicinity of the acquired land. The landowners have prayed for awarding appropriate compensation claiming that the market value of the acquired land, which is located within the Municipal limits of Karnal, was not less than Rs.1 crore per acre.

1.4 Per contra, the HSIIDC while filing the reply contends that the LAC has offered appropriate, fair and adequate market value of the acquired land, therefore, there is no scope for revising the same.

1.5 The RC has framed the following issues:-

“1) What was the market value of the acquired land at the time of notification under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act? OPP.

2) Relief.”

1.6 The only issue which requires adjudication is as to what is the appropriate market value of the acquired land.

2. **Oral and Documentary evidence:-**

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

PW1	Satpal
PW2	Goverdhan Dass
PW3	Ram Kumar, Draftsman
PW4	Rajinder Veer Singh
PW5	Des Raj, Clerk, DC Office
PW6	Vijay Kumar, photographer
PW7	Rajinder Parshad
PW8	Jiwan Singh
PW9	Sachin Singla
PW10	Ajay Kumar
PW11	Surender Goel
PW12	Sanjay Aggarwal
PW13	Suman Saini
PW14	Dharamveer Singh

2.2 In documentary evidence, the landowners, apart from the sale deeds, details whereof is extracted in para 3.7 have produced the following documentary evidence:-

Ex.P1 to P19	Certified copies of sale deeds
Ex.P20	Certified copy of award dated 31.07.2010
Ex.P21 to Ex.P50	Photographs
Ex.P51	CD
Ex.P52	Receipt of photographer
Ex.P53	Information under RTI dt. 16.1.2014

Ex.PW3/B	Scaled site plan
Ex.P54, P55	Annexures I and II
Ex.P56&P57	Information under RTI Act
Ex.P58	Annexure 1(a)
Ex.P59	Copy of letter HSIDC
Ex.P60	Annexure II
Ex.P61 & P62	Copies of Collector list
Ex.P63	Copy of sale deed
Ex.P64 to P66	Copies of jamabandies
Ex.P67	Copy of sale deed
Ex.P68	Letter of RTI
Ex.P69&P72	Copies of sale deeds
Ex.P73	Copy of Special power of attorney
Ex.P74 to P76	Copies of sale deeds
Ex.P77	C/o deed endorsement
Ex.P80 to P82	C/o site plan
Ex.P83 to P85	C/o sale deeds
Mark X	C/o site plan
Mark 2	C/o jamabandi
Mark 3	C/o sale deed
Mark 4	C/o award dt. 10.1.2014

2.3 In oral evidence, the HSIIDC has examined the following witnesses:-

RW1	Balkar Singh, Kanungo
RW2	Rakesh Kumar, Assistant Manager, HSIDC

2.4 In documentary evidence, the HSIIDC apart from the sale deeds, details whereof is in para 3.7 has produced the following documents:-

Ex.R1	C/o award passed by LAC
Ex.R2	C/o fixation letter
Ex.R3 to R11	Copy of the sale deeds
Ex.R12	C/o Akshizra

2.5 In the file of RC's award dated 10.02.2015, the landowners have, in oral evidence, examined, PW1-Balbir Singh, PW2-Karambir Singh, PW3-Krishan Lal.

2.6 In documentary evidence, they have produced Ex.P1 to P7. Ex.P4 is a copy of mutation no.25087 dated 06.09.2005 Ex.P5 is a copy of jamabandi for the year 2004-05. Ex.P6 is a copy of the mutation no.30370 dated 30.05.2009. Ex.P7 is again a copy of mutation no.30371 dated 06.06.2009. Ex.P1, P2 and P3 are sale deeds details whereof are compiled in the table given in para 3.7.

2.7 On the other hand, HSIIDC examined RW-1 Balbir Singh, Kanungo in oral evidence.

2.8 In documentary evidence, the State has produced the RC's previous judgment dated 27.08.2014 as Ex.R1 a copy of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, Ex.R2 and statement no.19 as Ex.R3.

3. Discussion by the Court:-

3.1 At this stage, it would be appropriate to carefully examine the reasons recorded in the judgment passed by the RC on 21.08.2014. The sale deeds Ex.P17, P18 and P19 are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The sale instances Ex. P1, P2, P3, P4, P9, P11, P12, P13, P14 and P15 are with respect to small parcels of land whereas the sale deeds Ex.P5, P6, P7, P8, P10 and P16 are with respect to plots located in the industrial sector 37, which is far away from the acquired land. Thus, the RC came to a conclusion that none of the sale deeds produced by the landowners is with respect to the comparable parcel of land during the contemporaneous period. Thereafter, while

analyzing the sale deeds, produced by the HSIIDC from Ex.R3 to R11, it has been observed that the sale deeds of these parcels of land cannot be relied upon, as the distance of the acquired land from the aforesaid parcel of land represented by Ex.R3 to R11, has not been shown and the rate at which the various parcels of land have been sold, being below the amount offered by the LAC, cannot be considered. Thereafter, the RC examined the various awards passed by the Court assessing the market value and ultimately relies upon award dated 31.07.2010 wherein the market value has been assessed at the rate of Rs.475/- per square yard as on 17.05.2002. The RC found such assessment to be reliable, therefore, the court added escalation @ 12% per year from 17.05.2002 to 11.07.2006 and arrived at a figure of Rs.40,20,884/- per acre.

3.2 Before proceeding further, it would be appropriate to analyze the correctness of the reasons recorded by the RC. The RC was correct in observing that the sale deed Ex.P1, P2, P14 and P15 are with respect to very small parcels of land, therefore, not comparable. Further, the reasons given for refusing to rely upon the sale instances with respect to the period post the date of notification i.e Ex.P17 to Ex.P19 are also correct. However, the RC has erred in observing that the sale instances Ex.P3, P4, P9, P11, P12 and P13 are with respect to small parcels of land. In fact, the RC has overlooked these sale deeds. Ex.P9 is with respect to 6 bighas of land, which is nearly 1 ½ acres of land. Such parcel of land cannot be said to be small. Sale deed Ex.P13 is also with respect to 4 bighas and 5 biswas of land, which is again nearly 1 acre of land.

3.3 The RC was correct in making an observation that the sale instances Ex.P5, P6, P7, P8, P10, and P16 are with respect to parcels of land located in a developed Sector 37, which is located far away from the acquired land. However, it has erred in observing that the HSIIDC has not produced evidence to show the distance between the various parcels of land represented by the various sale instances produced by the State. In fact, the RC has overlooked a layout plan Ex.R12 produced by the HSIIDC, which is a part of the RC's record. On a careful perusal of Ex.R-12 layout plan, it is evident that the acquired land has been highlighted in yellow colour whereas the respective parcels of land sold through various sale deeds have been specified. The parcel of land sold through sale deeds Ex.R6 (dated 03.01.2006) is located hardly 10 acres away from the acquired land. Even sale deeds Ex.R3 and R5 are also with respect to the parcels of land located 10 acres away from the acquired land. The parcel of land sold vide sale deeds Ex.R4 is 15 acres away from the acquired land. Thus, the RC has erred while observing that the distance between the acquired land and the various parcels of land produced by the HSIIDC has not been proved.

3.4 Similarly, while wrongly interpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act, the RC has erred in not considering the sale instances Ex.R3 to R11 on the ground that market value reflected in the aforesaid sale deeds is below the amount of market value offered by the LAC. In fact, there is neither any prohibition nor any bar for the court to take into consideration the sale instances produced by the parties, even if these sale deeds reflect a price lower than the amount offered by the LAC. On

a careful reading of Section 25 of the 1894 Act, it is evident that the statute only prohibits the court from awarding amount less than the amount offered by the LAC under Section 11 of the 1894 Act. This issue is no longer res integra in view of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in **Lal Chand vs. UOI and others (2009) 15 SCC 769**.

3.5 It may be noted here that on a careful perusal of the record, it is evident that the RC has also failed to notice that the landowners have also produced sale deeds Ex.P67, P69, P70, P71, P72, P74, P75, P76, P83, P84 and P85. The RC should have analysed all the sale deeds produced by both the parties.

3.6 The RC also failed to take a note of fact that the award dated 31.07.2010 relied upon by the RC to assess the market value of the acquired land in this acquisition has already been set aside by the High Court vide judgment dated 25.09.2014 in **Smt. Kanta Devi and others vs. State of Haryana** (RFA no. 640 of 2011)

3.7 Before analyzing the arguments of the learned counsel representing the parties, it is of utmost importance to analyze the various sale instances produced by the respective parties in evidence. A tabulated compilation of the various sale instances produced by the respective parties is extracted as under:-

Sale exemplars produced by the landowners

Sr. No.	Exhibits	Sale deed No.	Date	Total Area	Sale consideration Rs.	Price per acre Rs.	Village
1.	Ex.P1/ Ex.P15	2076	15.6.2000	20 sq.yards	60,000/-	1,45,20,000/-	Motinagar, Karnal
2.	Ex.P1	8081	10.10.2005	550 Sq.Yards	4,20,000/-	36,96,000/-	Karnal
3.	Ex.P2	6576	26.3.2003	655.176sq.yard	7,00,000/-	51,71,129/-	Karnal

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)
and other connected cases

10

4.	Ex.P2	6252	09.08.2005	2Bigha-2Biswa	63,50,400/-	1,45,15,200/-	Karnal
5.	Ex.P3/ Ex.P20	8739	18.3.2004	7Bigha-8Biswa	51,80,000/-	33,36,000/-	Karnal
6.	Ex.P3	8036	07.10.2005	150 sq.yards	1,05,000/-	33,88,000/-	Karnal
7.	Ex.P4/ Ex.P21 Ex.P-69	13572	28.3.2005	53.77 sq.yard	4,00,000/-	3,60,05,207/-	Karnal
8.	Ex.P5/ Ex.P22	154	5.4.2005	67B-02B	4,99,54,166/-	35,73,484/-	Karnal
9.	Ex.P6/ Ex.P23	423	11.4.2005	44Bigha-19Biswa	3,55,85,416/-	38,00,007/-	Karnal
10.	Ex.P7	698	20.4.2005	29Bigha-11Biswa	2,38,29,167/-	38,70,735/-	Karnal
11.	Ex.P8	928	21.04.2005	49Bigha-11Biswa	3,92,27,100/-	38,00,011/-	Karnal
12.	Ex.P9	1353	29.4.2005	6Bigha-0Biswa	49,62,500/-	39,69,606/-	Karnal
13.	Ex.P10	9004	9.11.2005	28Bigha-17Biswa	3,00,47,080/-	49,99,174/-	Karnal
14.	Ex.P11	112 39	3.1.2006	25 sq.yards	75,000/-	1,45,20,000/-	Karnal
15.	Ex.P12 / Ex.P71	11723	13.01.2006	1Bigha-13Biswa	51,61,000/-	1,50,13,457/-	Kambopura
16.	Ex.P13	1172 6	13.1.2006	4Bigha-5Biswa	1,36,48,000/-	1,54,15,711/-	Kambopura
17.	Ex.P14 / Ex.P72	1233 6	30.1.2006	28 sq.yards	1,50,000/-	2,59,28,571/-	Karnal
18.	Ex.P14	711	13.05.1991	37Bigha-8Biswa	56,10,000/-	7,20,002/-	Kambopura
19.	Ex.P15	1259 0	6.2.2006	25 sq.yards	75,000/-	1,45,20,000/-	Karnal
20.	Ex.P16	301	13.04.2006	18Bigha-2.5Biswa	1,88,80,208/-	50,00,014/-	Karnal
21.	Ex.P16 / Ex.P63	3151	17.07.2001	374 sq.yards	2,00,000/-	25,88,235/-	Karnal
22.	Ex.P17	5590	22.9.2006	1Bigha-14Biswa	65,13,200/-	1,83,89,747/-	Kambopura
23.	Ex.P17 / Ex.P64	3152	17.07.2001	374 sq.yards	2,00,000/-	25,88,235/-	Karnal
24.	Ex.P18	5591	22.9.2006	1Bigha-14Biswa	65,13,200/-	1,83,89,747/-	Kambopura
25.	Ex.P18	1926	28.05.2002	33 sq.yards	50,000/-	73,33,333/-	Karnal
26.	Ex.P19 / Ex.P28	7729	14.12.2006	16Bigha-9Biswa	2,74,16,666/-	80,00,040/-	Karnal
27.	Ex.P19	2176	14.07.2003	413 sq.yards	4,00,000/-	46,87,651/-	Karnal
28.	Ex.P24	130 84	16.02.2006	3 Acre, 3 kanal 9 marla	5,52,43,125/-	1,61,00,000/-	Balri
29.	Ex.P25	2254	17.05.2006	14Bigha-17Biswa	2,61,32,290/-	84,46,795/-	Karnal

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)
and other connected cases

11

30.	Ex.P26	2754	01.06.2006	9Bigha-14Biswa	1,33,37,500/-	65,99,989/-	Karnal
31.	Ex.P27	2755	01.06.2006	25Bigha-14Biswa	3,53,37,500	66,00,009/-	Karnal
32.	Ex.P29	6576	26.03.2003	655sq. yards	7,00,000/-	5,17,252/-	Karnal
33.	Ex.P38	4326	29.10.1999	775.9 sq.yards	3,65,000/-	22,76,840/-	Karnal
34.	Ex.P-61	3530	06.01.1995	22.22 sq.yards	12,000/-	26,13,861/-	Karnal
35.	Ex.P-62	4893	09.10.2000	8 Biswa	2,30,000/-	27,59,818/-	Karnal
36.	Ex.P-63	2396	19.05.2006	360 sq.yards	3,60,000/-	48,40,000	Karnal
37.	Ex.P-65	2201	15.06.2007	6 Acre, 4 kanal 8 marla	4,84,70,000	74,00,000/-	Bajida Jattan
38.	Ex.P-67	8737	28.10.2005	3Bigha-4Biswa	4,00,000/-	5,99,999/-	Karnal
39.	Ex.P-70	6542	31.10.2006	806 sq.yards	12,09,000/-	72,60,000/-	Karnal
40.	Ex.P-74	1548	07.05.2004	267 sq.yards	1,60,000/-	29,00,374/-	Karnal
41.	Ex.P-75	11303	08.02.2005	27 sq.yards	81,000/-	1,45,20,000/-	Karnal
42.	Ex.P-76	1547	07.05.2004	533 sq.yards	3,20,000/-	29,05,816/-	Karnal
43.	Ex.P-83	820	25.04.2006	2 Acre 4 Marla	1,72,12,500/-	85,00,000/-	Uchana
44.	Ex.P-84	2208	17.05.2006	1 Acre, 3 kanal	1,16,87,500/-	85,00,000/-	Uchana
45.	Ex.P-85	2209	17.05.2006	2 Acre, 3 Kanal 9 Marla	2,06,65,625/-	85,00,000/-	Uchana

Sale exemplars produced by the HSIIDC

Sr. No.	Exhibits	Sale deed No.	dated	Area	Sale considerati on Rs.	Price per Acre Rs.	Village
1.	Ex.R3	3541	31.5.2005	5Bigha 9Biswa	6,81,500/-	6,00,219/-	Karnal
2.	Ex.R4	10647	19.12.05	4 Bigha 6Biswa	5,37,500/-	5,99,999/-	Karnal
3.	Ex.R5	3540	31.5.2005	3Bigha 16Biswa	4,75,000/-	5,99,993/-	Karnal
4.	Ex.R6	11265	3.1.2006	2Bigha 2Biswa	2,62,413/-	5,99,801/-	Karnal
5.	Ex.R7	11862	17.1.2006	4Bigha 3Biswa	5,19,000/-	6,00,290/-	Karnal
6.	Ex.R8	830	26.4.2006	2Bigha 3Biswa	3,65,000/-	8,14,882/-	Karnal
7.	Ex.R9	14757	23.3.2006	2Bigha 8Biswa	3,00,000/-	5,99,995/-	Karnal

8.	Ex.R10	5230	7.7.2005	4Bigha 16Biswa	6,00,000/-	5,99,995/-	Karnal
9.	Ex.R11	6466	16.8.2005	4Bigha 16Biswa	6,00,000/-	5,99,995/-	Karnal
10.	Ex.D-1	3059	12.07.2001	5Bigha 17Biswa	4,27,000/-	3,50,357/-	Karnal
11.	Ex.D-2	2154	12.06.2001	40Bigha 17Biswa	29,24,000/-	3,43,580/-	Karnal
12.	Ex.D-3	3058	12.07.2001	5Bigha 18Biswa	4,31,000/-	3,50,642/-	Karnal
13.	Ex.D-4	3899	17.08.2001	24Bigha 16Biswa	18,10,000/-	3,50,323/-	Karnal
14.	Ex.D-5	7436	19.12.2001	24Bigha 19Biswa	19,00,000/-	3,65,544/-	Karnal

Note:- For the sake of clarity, a glossary of words and expressions used in the judgment is noted below

Rectangle	25 acres of compact parcel of land (5x5 acres)
Acre	4840 square yards (Divided into 8 Kanals)
Kanal	605 square yards (Divided into 20 Marlas)
Marla	30.25 square yards
Bigha	1000.33 square yards (Divided into 20 Biswas)
Biswa	50.4165 square yard

3.8 Heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the judgment passed by the RC with reference to the RC’s record, which was requisitioned.

3.9 On the one hand, learned counsel representing the landowners contends that the RC has wrongly granted escalation at the rate of 12% per annum whereas it should be cumulative escalation @ 15% per year. They submit that the land in question has been acquired for developing the extension of the already developed Industrial Area. They submit that Supreme Court assessed the market value of the abutting land as on 13.03.1981 at the rate of **Rs.66.21/- per square yard**. They submit that thereafter, vide notification dated 17.05.2002, more than 55 acres of land was acquired. Now, by notification dated

11.07.2006, more than 62 acres of land has been acquired. They contend that the acquired land falls within the municipal limits and therefore, the market value should be increased by calculating cumulative increase at the rate of 15% per annum. They have also filed written submissions apart from their oral arguments, which shall be examined in the later part of the judgment.

3.9 Per contra, learned counsel representing the HSIIDC while referring to Ex.R12 contends that the RC has erred in assessing the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.40,20,884/- per acre.

3.10 On a comparative analysis of the hereinbefore produced tabulated information, alongwith the layout plan Ex.PW3/B produced by the landowners, it is evident that the sale deeds Ex.P3, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P17, P18 and P19 are with respect to parcels of land located across the GT Road i.e National Highway No.1 Delhi Amritsar Road (now renumbered as NH-44). In fact, the acquired land is on the western side of the National Highway whereas the aforesaid sale exemplars are with respect to various parcel of land located on the Eastern side. It is important to note that the acquired land is at a distance from the GT Road. In this acquisition, the land acquired is not with respect to parcel of land located on GT Road. In fact, in 1991, the HSIIDC had acquired land abutting the National Highway. In the year 2002, another parcel of land was acquired for developing Sector 3-A. Thus, Sector 3, Industrial Area, is located near the National Highway. Further, going towards the West, another parcel of land has been utilized for developing Sector 3A. Thereafter, there is a village road which goes to village Bajida. This

acquired land is located across the Bajida road towards the Western side. Hence, it is not appropriate to assess the market value of the acquired land on the basis of assessment of the market value of the parcel of land located on GT Road.

3.11. The HSIIDC has developed Sector 37 on the Eastern side of the National Highway. The sale deeds Ex.P3, P12, P13 are with respect to parcels of land located in Sector 37 which falls on the Eastern side of the GT Road. The sale deeds Ex.P3, P12 and P13 are also with respect to various parcels of land abutting the National Highway falling within Sector 37. After Sector 37 comes to an end, further towards the Eastern side across old Mughal Canal, Sector 36 has been developed. Sector 36 is located at a distance from the National Highway. The sale deeds Ex.P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P17 and P18 are with respect to the various parcels of land located in Sector 36. The sale deeds Ex.P16 and P19 are with respect to parcel of land, which are located far away. The sale instance Ex.P1 is also with respect to parcel of located towards the Eastern side of the National Highway. As per the layout plan, the various parcels of land represented by sale instances Ex. P4, P11, P12, P14 and P5 falls towards the Western side of the National Highway. However, on a careful study of the khasra numbers of the sale deeds, it is evident that the sale instance Ex.P5 is with respect to the land located in Sector 36 towards the Eastern side and not towards the Western side of the National Highway.

3.12 The sale deed Ex. P11 is with respect to a tiny plot measuring 25 sq. yards located on Bajida Road. Similarly, sale deed

Ex.P14 is again with respect to a tiny plot of 28 square yards on Bajida Road, which is a village Road. Such sale deeds, in the presence of voluminous evidence of comparable sale deeds, cannot be said to be comparable. Apart from that, the landowners have produced sale instances Ex.P67, P69, P70, P71, P72, P74, P75, P76, P83, P86, P84 and P85, however, their comparative location has not been depicted in the layout plan either before the RC or before this Court. The sale deeds Ex.P83, P84 and P85 are with respect of the parcels of land located in village Uchana, which is a totally different village. No evidence has been led to prove the location of village Uchana. In the absence of evidence of comparative location of the parcels of land sold through the aforesaid sale deeds, it would not be appropriate to rely upon the same, particularly, when the sale deeds Ex.P69, P70, P71, P72, P74, P75, P76 are also with respect to very small parcels of land. Ordinarily, an acre of land consists of 4840 square yards. In the context of agricultural land, the word 'Rectangle' denotes 25 acres of land located in a compact parcel. Some of the sale deeds refer to the size of parcel of land in bighas and biswas which reflect that the consolidation of holdings in accordance with the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1953 has not taken place. The counsel representing HSIIDC after enquiring from local revenue official has informed that one bigha of land consist of the following area:-

1 Bigha = 1008.33 Sq.Yds. (20 Biswa)
1 Biswa = 50.42 Sq.Yds. (20 Biswansi)

3.13 Ex.R12 is a revenue layout plan of the area reflecting the location of the various parcels of land representing the sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC. The acquired land is reflected in orange colour whereas the land sold through the various sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC with respect to the various parcels is identified in yellow colour. The sale instances Ex.R3, R5, R6 are with respect to the various parcels of land located at a distance of 10 acres from the acquired land whereas the sale instance Ex.R4 is with respect to parcel of land located on the road around 15 acres away from the acquired land. Ex.R1, R3, R4, R5 are with respect to comparable parcels of land. In the year 2005, the comparable parcel of land with the acquired land has been sold at a rate lesser than the amount offered by the LAC. The per acre price of sale instances Ex.R3, R4, R5 is around Rs.6,00,000/- per acre whereas Ex.R6 reflects that the land has been sold at the rate of Rs.5,56,600/- per acre. On a comparative analysis of the location of the aforesaid sale instances produced by the landowners and HSIIDC, it is evident that the sale exemplars produced by the HSIIDC are not only located near to the acquired land as in comparison to the sale deeds produced by the landowners but are, also, better located for placing reliance so as to assess the market value of the acquired land.

3.14 At this stage, it would be appropriate to carefully examine the previous judgment of the RC passed on 31.07.2010, which has been relied upon to assess the market value. The RC was assessing the market value of 55 acres of land acquired vide notification dated 17.05.2002.

The RC while relying upon the assessment of the market value in a

previous judgment as on 31.03.1981 at the rate of **Rs.66.21/- per square yard**, assessed the market value of the acquired land as on 17.05.2002, by calculating cumulative increase at the rate of 12% per annum for a period of more than 21 years. Thus, the RC worked out a figure of Rs.475/- per square yard. The judgment dated 31.07.2010 has already been set aside by the High Court on 25.09.2014 in **Smt. Kanta Devi and others vs. State of Haryana and others** (RFA-640-2011). Even in the absence of the judgment dated 25.09.2014, it was not appropriate for the RC, in the judgment dated 31.07.2010, to assess the market value of the acquired land on the basis of perceived cumulative increase at the rate of 12% for a period of more than 2 decades. The market value of the land depends upon various factors including its location, development in the surroundings, potential of land etc. After a passage of 21 years, when Sector 3, Industrial area was planned to be developed in the vicinity, the prices of the land in the area did not increase exponentially. The various sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC support the aforesaid conclusion. Ex.R8 reflects that the highest price is Rs.8,13,120/- per acre whereas on an average, the land is being sold at the rate of Rs.6,00,000/- per acre. In the impugned judgment, the RC has further given 12% increase on Rs.475/- square yard for a period of more than 4 years to assess the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.830.76 per square yard (Rs.40,20,884/- per acre). The RC, in substance, has estimated the market value, after calculating increase for nearly 25 years. This in my considered view, is not permissible. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down in **ONGC vs. Jeewan Bhai Patel (2008) 14 SCC 745** and **Lal**

Chand (supra) that such perceived projection can, at the most, be applied for a period of 3-4 years.

3.15 Now, let us examine the various parcels of land located on Bajida Road. The LAC has awarded Rs.15,00,000/- per acre upto the depth of 2 acres from the GT Road, however, the commercial potentiality of the land abutting Bajida Road has not been considered. The landowners have produced two sale instances i.e Ex.P4 and P11 which are of very small parcels of land. These tiny parcels of land are not comparable with the acquired land. On a careful perusal of layout plan Ex.R12, it is evident that substantial part of the acquired land is abutting Bajida Road. Some part of the aforesaid land has become commercially useful in view of sale deeds, of two plots, Ex.P4 and P11 executed for constructing shops. These parcels of land are in respect of plots located on Bajida Road. Hence, the land upto the depth of 2 acres on Bajida Road is also assessed at the rate of Rs.15,00,000/- per acre.

3.16 It may be noted here that the landowners have failed to draw the attention of the Court to any evidence which would help the Court to come to a conclusion that strip of land beyond the depth of 2 acres on the Western side of Bajida Road was being used or had the potential to be used for commercial or residential purpose. As on 11.07.2006, this parcel of land beyond the depth of 2 acres from the Bajida Road is proved to be used for agricultural purpose. Hence, this parcel of land is not comparable with the land located in Sector 3, Industrial Area or Sector 3A or Grain and Vegetable Market or Sector 16, Karnal.

3.17 Most of the arguments of the learned counsel representing the landowners have already been analyzed, however, it may be noted that the cumulative increase as prayed for by the learned counsel representing the landowners is not found appropriate, particularly when the sale deeds of comparable parcels of land have already been produced.

4.Decision:-

4.1 Consequently, the award passed by the RC is modified. The market value assessed by the RC in both the awards dated 27.08.2014 and 10.02.2015 is set aside. It is held that the market value offered by the LAC for land beyond the depth of 2 acres from Bajida Road shall stand restored. Whereas, the land upto the depth of 2 acres on the Bajida Road is assessed at the rate of Rs.15,00,000/- per acre. With these observations, the appeals as well as the cross objection, filed by the HSIIDC shall stand allowed, whereas, the appeals filed by the landowners shall stand dismissed.

4.2 Learned counsel representing the landowners did not draw the attention of the Court to any error in the apportionment of the compensation by the RC. Hence, the aforesaid aspect has not been examined.

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

30.09.2022
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)
and other connected cases

20

Sr. No.	Case No.	Parties
1	RFA-10339-2014	SAT PARKASH AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
2	RFA-1139-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. PHOOLO DEVI & ORS
3	RFA-1141-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. REKHA SAINI & ORS
4	RFA-1126-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. VINOD KUMAR & ORS
5	RFA-1128-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. MAYA DEVI & ORS
6	RFA-1296-2015	PAWAN KUMAR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
7	RFA-1145-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. ANAND KUMAR & ORS
8	RFA-1147-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAJ RANI AND ORS
9	RFA-1148-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM AND ORS
10	RFA-1149-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. BALBIR SINGH AND ORS
11	RFA-1150-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. TARA CHAND NAGPAL AND ORS
12	RFA-1152-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. SUSHILA SHARMA AND ORS
13	RFA-1154-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. YASHPAL (DECEASED) THR. LRS AND ORS
14	RFA-1156-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PAWAN KUMAR & ORS
15	RFA-1160-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAJINDER PARSHAD & ORS
16	RFA-1125-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAJ KUMAR & ORS
17	RFA-1517-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM & ORS
18	RFA-1521-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. USHA RANI & ORS
19	RFA-1524-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. ARJUN SINGH @ PARVEEN KUMAR & ORS
20	RFA-1526-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. KRISHAN KUMAR AND ORS
21	RFA-1527-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. FATEH SINGH & ORS
22	RFA-1013-2015	SANDEEDP VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
23	RFA-1127-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. MONIKA & ORS
24	RFA-1130-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. USHA MALIK & ORS
25	RFA-1133-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. PARMILA AND ORS
26	RFA-1142-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. MAHESH CHANDER GOSSAIN & ORS
27	RFA-1151-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. GOVERDHAN DASS AND ORS
28	RFA-1159-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PAWAN VIR & ORS
29	RFA-1161-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. MEENA AND ORS
30	RFA-1163-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. AJAY KUMAR & ORS
31	RFA-1513-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. NEELAM AND ORS
32	RFA-1514-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SHAKUNTLA DEVI AND ORS
33	RFA-1516-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SANJEEV KUMAR & ORS

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)

and other connected cases

21

34	RFA-1080-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAJINDER KUMAR AND ORS
35	RFA-1518-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. NEELAM & ORS
36	RFA-1519-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. LACHHMI CHAND & ORS
37	RFA-1520-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. NAVNEET SINGH & ORS
38	RFA-1523-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SURINDER SINGH & ORS
39	RFA-1525-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SATPAL & ORS
40	RFA-1528-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAMESH KUMAR AND ORS
41	RFA-1529-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. CHATTAR SINGH (DECEASED) THR. LRS. AND ORS
42	RFA-1146-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. JOGINDER SINGH & ORS
43	RFA-1507-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SAMPURAN SINGH & ORS
44	RFA-1508-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SAT PARKASH & ORS
45	RFA-1509-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. MAYA DEVI & ORS
46	RFA-1510-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAVINDER SINGH & ORS
47	RFA-1515-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAM BILAS AND ORS
48	RFA-1138-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PATASHO DEVI DECEASED THR. LRS. AND ORS
49	RFA-1522-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PARVEEN KUMAR & ORS
50	RFA-1077-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. JAMSHIDA AND ORS
51	RFA-1079-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. SHARBATI DEVI AND ORS
52	RFA-1091-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SUSHIL CHAND AND ORS
53	RFA-1511-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAMESH KUMAR AND ORS
54	RFA-1132-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. RASHMI AGGARWAL & ORS
55	RFA-1137-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. VEENA RANI AND ORS
56	RFA-1078-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PAWAN KUMAR AND ORS
57	RFA-1162-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. KRISHAN KUMAR AND ORS
58	RFA-1076-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM AND ORS
59	RFA-2221-2016	TARA CHAND NAGPAL VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
60	RFA-4041-2016	SURENDER SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
61	RFA-358-2015	USHA MALIK AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
62	RFA-359-2015	SMT. SHARBATI DEVI VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
63	RFA-360-2015	HEMANT VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
64	RFA-362-2015	NAVNEET SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
65	RFA-10800-2014	PAWAN VIR & ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

**RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)
and other connected cases**

22

66	RFA-350-2015	SAMPURAN SINGH & ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
67	RFA-352-2015	NEELAM & ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
68	RFA-353-2015	SUSHIL CHAND VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
69	RFA-10477-2014	VINOD KUMR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
70	RFA-10426-2014	PAWAN KUMAR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
71	RFA-383-2015	PARVEEN KUMAR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
72	RFA-786-2016	BALBIR SINGH AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
73	RFA-3589-2015	SUNIL KUMAR (SINCE DECEASED) TH LR PARVEEN VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
74	RFA-3414-2015	SACHIN SINGLA VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
75	RFA-3216-2015	ARJUN SINGH @ PARVEEN KUMAR AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
76	RFA-2932-2015	SATPAL AND ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
77	RFA-4546-2017	MANI RAM (DECEASED) THR LRS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
78	RFA-5595-2017	PHOOL SINGH AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
79	RFA-5596-2017	PHOOL SINGH AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
80	RFA-4544-2017	GANGA DEVI AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
81	RFA-4545-2017	PARMALI AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
82	RFA-4547-2017	PUSHPA DEVI AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
83	RFA-4523-2017	DAYA RAM VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
84	RFA-3041-2018	PARMESHWARI DEVI (DECEASED) THR. LRS AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
85	RFA-648-2015	VIKRAMJIT SINGH ALIAS VIKRAM VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
86	RFA-3940-2016	SUSHILA SHARMA (DECEASED) THR. HER LRS AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
87	RFA-1131-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. HARI PARKASH & ORS
88	RFA-1123-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. AJMER SINGH & ORS
89	RFA-1124-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAM NATH & ORS
90	RFA-1129-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. JAGMAL SINGH & ORS
91	RFA-1014-2015	AJAY KUMAR THR. GPA VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
92	RFA-1136-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAJIV AND ORS
93	RFA-1140-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. BALBIR SINGH & ORS
94	RFA-1144-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. DHARAMVIR SINGH & ORS
95	RFA-1153-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. AMARDEEP AND ORS
96	RFA-1081-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM AND ORS
97	RFA-1083-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. CHATTAR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THR. LRS. AND ORS
98	RFA-1087-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PARDEEP KUMAR

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)

and other connected cases

23

		AND ORS
99	RFA-1088-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. BALA DEVI AND ORS
100	RFA-1096-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SANDEEP KUMAR AND ORS
101	RFA-936-2015	RAVINDER SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
102	RFA-1135-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. KRIPAL SINGH AND ORS
103	RFA-1143-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SURINDER GOEL & ORS
104	RFA-1157-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. ISHAM SINGH & ORS
105	RFA-1158-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PARAMVIR & ORS
106	RFA-361-2015	LACHHMI CHAND AND ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
107	RFA-292-2015	SMT. ROSHNI DEVI VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
108	RFA-1084-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SUBASH CHAND AND ORS
109	RFA-1089-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SACHIN SINGLA AND ORS
110	RFA-1073-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. INDRAWATI AND ORS
111	RFA-1075-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. SUNEHARI AND ORS
112	RFA-1093-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. ROSHNI DEVI AND ORS
113	RFA-1094-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PARAMJIT KAUR AND ORS
114	RFA-1095-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. GANESH GARG AND ORS
115	RFA-1122-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. RAM SINGH & ORS
116	RFA-1085-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SMT. OM PATTI AND ORS
117	RFA-1086-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. HEMANT AND ORS
118	RFA-1090-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SUNIL KUMAR AND ORS
119	RFA-1092-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. PREM LATA AND ORS
120	RFA-1015-2015	RAM BILAS THR. GPA VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
121	RFA-965-2015	MONIKA VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
122	RFA-1082-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SANDEEP AND ORS
123	RFA-1074-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SATWANTI DEVI AND ORS
124	RFA-1585-2015	SMT. PATASHO DEVI THR. HER LEGAL HEIRS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
125	RFA-2340-2015	SHAM LAL AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
126	RFA-1904-2015	GOVERDHAN DASS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
127	RFA-1906-2015	ISHAM SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
128	RFA-2378-2015	AMAN AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
129	RFA-2153-2015	SMT. OM PATTI VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
130	RFA-544-2017	HSIIDC VS. VED PARKASH (SINCE DECEASED) THR. LRS AND ORS
131	RFA-785-2016	BALBIR SINGH AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)

and other connected cases

24

		AND ORS.
132	RFA-1155-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM AND ORS
133	RFA-1097-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. SHAM LAL AND ORS
134	RFA-10616-2014	BALBIR SINGH AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
135	RFA-10475-2014	KRISHAN KUMAR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
136	RFA-10476-2014	SMT. PARMILA VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
137	RFA-185-2016	SMT. CHAMELI DEVI (SINCE DECEASED) THR. LRS. AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
138	RFA-548-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. BALBIR SINGH & ORS.
139	RFA-547-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. MOHINDER SINGH & OTHERS
140	RFA-526-2019	RAM SINGH DECEASED, THROUGH HIS LRS VS. THE STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
141	RFA-545-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. GANGA DEVI & ORS
142	RFA-550-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. MANI RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THR. LRS. & ORS
143	RFA-552-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. RAMESH KUMAR AND ORS
144	RFA-3500-2017	RAM SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
145	RFA-540-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. HARI PARKASH AND ORS
146	RFA-543-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. PUSHPA DEVI & OTHERS
147	RFA-546-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. DAYA RAM & OTHERS
148	RFA-533-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. KARAMBIR & ORS
149	RFA-538-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. RAM SINGH & ORS
150	RFA-535-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. PARMALI & OTHERS
151	RFA-1322-2017	RAJINDER PARSHAD AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
152	RFA-553-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. KRISHAN LAL & OTHERS
153	RFA-536-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. SMT. CHAMELI DEVI DECEASED THR. LRS & OTHERS
154	RFA-537-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. KANWAR BHAN & OTHERS
155	RFA-539-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. SARUPI DEV & OTHERS
156	RFA-541-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. PHOOLU & OTHERS
157	RFA-534-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. RAM KUMAR & ORS
158	RFA-551-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. PARMESHWAR I DEVI & OTHERS
159	RFA-542-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. AMAN & OTHERS
160	RFA-549-2017	HSIIDC LTD. VS. NEELAM AND ORS
161	RFA-1134-2015	SENIOR MANAGER HSIIDC VS. JIWAN SINGH AND ORS
162	RFA-1297-2015	SMT. INDRAWATI AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
163	RFA-4425-2015	MOHINDER SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
164	RFA-4000-2018	SMT. BALA DEVI VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
165	RFA-4002-2018	RAJIV AND ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
166	RFA-9-2015	SMT. RASHMI AGGARWAL THR. HER GPA VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
167	RFA-552-2015	DHARAMVIR SINGH & ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
168	RFA-632-2015	JIWAN SINGH AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
169	RFA-634-2015	JAGMAL SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
170	RFA-356-2015	RAJ RANI AND ANR. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
171	RFA-384-2015	FATEH SINGH VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
172	RFA-633-2015	GANESH GARG VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
173	RFA-349-2015	PAWAN KUMAR & ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA &

RFA-10339-2014 (O&M)
and other connected cases

25

		ORS
174	RFA-522-2015	SMT. PHOOLU DEVI & ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
175	RFA-645-2015	VIKRAMJIT SINGH ALIAS VIKRAM VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
176	RFA-646-2015	VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
177	RFA-649-2015	VIKRAMJIT SINGH ALIAS VIKRAM VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
178	RFA-650-2015	VIKRAMJIT SINGH ALIAS VIKRAM VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
179	RFA-354-2015	ANAND KUMAR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
180	RFA-355-2015	SANJEEV KUMAR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
181	RFA-647-2015	VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
182	RFA-651-2015	RAMESH KUMAR & ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
183	RFA-382-2015	SANDEEP KUMAR AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
184	RFA-10-2015	SURINDER GOEL & ANR VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
185	RFA-385-2015	SMT. SUNEHARI AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS..
186	RFA-351-2015	USHA RANI & ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
187	RFA-357-2015	SATWANTI DEVI AND ORS VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
188	RFA-363-2015	SMT. PARAMJIT KAUR VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
189	RFA-1512-2015	SENIOR MANAGER, HSIIDC VS. VIKRAMJIT SINGH @ VIKRAM AND ORS.
190	XOBJR-68-CI-2015	SENIOR MANAGER, HSIIDC VS. PARDEEP KUMAR AND ORS

30.09.2022
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE