In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Regular First Appeal No. 1485 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 25.03.2022

Manoj Kumar and Others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and Another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Kamal Mor, Advocate.
Mr. N.C.Kinra, Advocate.
Mr. S.P.Chahar, Advocate.
Mr. Kartar singh Malik, Advocate.
Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate.
Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate.
Mr. Pankaj Kaushik, Advocate.
Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate.
Mr. Saugat Khurana, Advocate.
Mr. Vishal Verma, Advocate for Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate.
Mr. Jitender Nara, Advocate.
Mr. Surinder Gandhi, Advocate,
for the landowners.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana and Ms. Vibha Tewari, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Through this batch of appeals, filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as "the 1894 Act"), the landowners as well as the State of Haryana challenge the awards passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as "the RC") on 25.09.2013 and 29.07.2016 while assessing the market value of the acquired land measuring

89.09 acres. The notification under Section 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as "the LAC") are common. The RC decided a batch of 21 reference petitions vide judgment dated 25.09.2013, whereas one reference petition was decided vide judgment dated 29.07.2016, while assessing the identical market value of the acquired land. The learned counsel representing the parties are *ad idem* that these appeals can conveniently be disposed of by a common judgment.

1.2 The relevant information concerning this bunch of appeals is compiled in a tabulated form, as under:-

Sr. No.	Date	Particulars
1.	15.12.2006	A notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, was issued proposing to acquire land, located in village Bohar, for the construction of water works in Sector 34, Rohtak.
2.	13.12.2007	A notification under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, was issued.
3.	31.03.2008	The LAC announced award No. 24 with respect to the land measuring 89.09 acres, while offering to pay the amount @ ₹20,00,000/- per acre to the landowners, apart from the statutory benefits.
4.	25.09.2013	The RC, while deciding the 21 reference petitions, had assessed the market value of the acquired land @ ₹25,50,680/- per acre.
5.	29.07.2016	The RC, vide a separate judgment, had assessed the same compensation, as was assessed in the award dated 25.09.2013.

1.3 The landowners claim that the land has an immense potential for being utilized in urban estate. It is contended that the acquired land is a part of the Rohtak City and many developing residential complexes have come up in this area. The Housing Board Colony, Sector 1, 2, 3, 4, Maharishi Dayanand University and the various other similar establishments, exist near the acquired land. The acquired land is not only developed, but is also ideally located for commercial activities as all the modern facilities like schools, hospitals and power supply etc. are available.

1.4 Per contra, the State of Haryana has contended that the LAC has correctly assessed the market value of the acquired land.

2. ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

2.1 The landowners (in LAC Case No. 42 of 11.02.2010, decided on 25.09.2013), in order to prove their case, examined PW.1 Dharamvir, PW.2 Pardeep, PW.3 Harpal, PW.4 Abhishek Singh, PW.5 Nafe Singh, PW.6 Manphool Singh. On the other hand, the State of Haryana examined Ram Niwas, Kanungo, as RW.1. Apart from the sale deeds (a tabulated compilation whereof is provided in para 2.5), the landowners produced the following documentary evidence:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the document
1.	Ex.PW.4/1	Copy of Resolution
2.	Ex.PW.4/2	Copy of Jamabandi
3.	Ex.PW.4/3	Copy of Mutation
4.	Ex.PW.4/9	Aks Shijra Plan (Revenue Layout Plan)

2.2 The State of Haryana, apart from the sale deeds (a tabulated compilation whereof is provided in para 2.5), produced the following documentary evidence:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the document
1.	Ex.R1	Copy of RR Policy
2.	Ex.R2	Copy of Haryana Government Notification under Section 4
3.	Ex.R3	Copy of Haryana Government Notification under Section 6

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the document
4.	Ex.R4	Copy of Collector Rate
5.	Ex.R5	Copy of Award
6.	Ex.R14	Copy of Site Plan

2.3 The RC, vide a separate judgment dated 29.07.2016, decided one reference petition i.e. LAC Case No. 32 of 02.06.2012. The landowners, in order to prove their case, have examined Rampal Yadav as PW.1. In the aforesaid reference, apart from the sale deeds (a tabulated compilation whereof is provided in para 2.5), the following documentary evidence was produced by the landowners:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Description of the document
1.	Ex.P1	Certified copy of the resolution passed in the meeting of the Board of Directors.
2.	Ex.P2	Copy of Award No. 24 dated 31.03.2008
3.	Ex.P3	Copy of Objections U/s 5-A of the Act
4.	Ex.P24	Certified copy of judgment passed by Sh.Jagjit Singh, ADJ, Rohtak, in LAC Case No. 42 of 11.2.2010 titled as "Ranwar v. State of Haryana and Others"
5.	Ex.P25	Jamabandi for the year 2008-2009

2.4 On the other hand, the State of Haryana did not lead any oral or documentary evidence in the aforesaid reference.

2.5 Further, for the sake of brevity, a consolidated compilation of the sale deeds/sale exemplars of village Bohar along with the relevant information, produced by the respective parties, is tabulated as under:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No. and Date	Total Area	Price Per Acre/ Total Price (in ₹)
1.	P1/D	923 dt. 04.05.2006	6K-17M	/77,01,563/ 89,94,526
2.	P-12, P1/E	924 dt. 04.05.2006	16K-8M	/1,84,54,687/ 90,02,286
3.	P-13, P1/F	925 dt. 04.05.2006	9K-11.68M	/1,07,82,188/ 90,00,156

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No. and Date	Total Area	Price Per Acre/ Total Price (in ₹)
4.	P-14, P1/G	926 dt. 04.05.2006	76K-7M	26,85,503/ 2,58,36,562
5.	P-9, P1/H	927 dt. 04.05.2006	6K-1M	90,01,240/ 68,07,188
6.	P-10, P1/L	928 dt. 04.05.2006	14K-10M	89,99,482/ 1,63,11,562
7.	P-4, P-20	1182 dt. 11.05.2006	21K-7M	35,00,000/ 93,40,625
8.	P-4, PW4/6	1302 dt. 04.05.2007	3K-13.52M	47,00,000/ 21,59,650
9.	P-5, PW4/8	1441 dt. 08.05.2007	2K-12.58M	46,99,392/ 15,44,338
10.	R-6	2306 dt. 09.06.2006	1 K	15,00,000/ 1,87,500
11.	R-7	2307 dt. 09.06.2006	1 K	15,00,000/ 1,87,500
12.	R-8	2308 dt. 09.06.2006	1 K	15,00,000/ 1,87,500
13.	R-9	2309 dt. 09.06.2006	1 K	15,00,000/ 1,87,500
14.	R-10	2367 dt. 12.06.2006	18.1236 M	15,75,845/ 1,78,500
15.	P-21, P1/B	2718 dt. 21.06.2006	23K-12M	43,00,000/ 1,26,85,000
16.	P-1, P-7	3067 dt. 03.07.2006	10K-9.88M	43,40,003/ 56,93,000
17.	P-5, P-6	3088 dt. 03.07.2006	8K-14M	35,00,000/ 38,06,250
18.	P-6, P-19	3090 dt. 03.07.2006	4K	35,00,000/ 17,50,000
19.	R-11	3200 dt. 06.07.2006	1K-6M	15,01,538/ 2,44,000
20.	P-2, P1/A, P-17, P-18	3498 dt. 17.07.2006	7K-8.8M	43,50,000/ 40,45,500
21.	R-12	3857 dt. 31.07.2006	11 M	15,05,454/ 1,03,500
22.	R-13	5143 dt. 11.09.2006	2K-13M	9,91,698/ 3,28,500
23.	P-3, P-22	7840 dt. 08.12.2006	1 Acre	45,00,000/ 45,00,000
24.	P-7, P-8	8699 dt. 03.01.2007	39K-11M	44,51,833/ 2,20,08,750

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No. and Date	Total Area	Price Per Acre/ Total Price (in ₹)
25.	P-15, PW4/4	10004 dt. 07.02.2007	3K-4M	47,00,000/ 18,80,000
26.	P-16, PW4/7	10010 dt. 07.02.2007	4K	47,00,000/ 23,50,000
27.	P-23, PW4/5	10157 dt. 13.02.2007	1A-1K-19M	47,00,000/ 58,45,625
28.	P-11, P1/C	12020 dt. 20.01.2006	19K-1M	1,04,81,102/ 2,49,58,125

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

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

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

3.1 Heard the learned counsel representing both the parties and with their able assistance, perused both the judgments passed by the RCs on 25.09.2013 as well as 29.07.2016 and examined the records of the Court below in both the cases, which were requisitioned.

3.2 The learned counsel representing the landowners have contended that the sale deeds No. 2718 (21.06.2006), 3067 (03.07.2006) and 7830 (08.12.2006) are with respect to the parcels of land, located close to the acquired land. It is further contended that the RC has erred in calculating the average per acre price of the various sale deeds. They further contend that the RC has erred, while observing that since the various parcels of land represented by various sale deeds produced by the landowners, appear to be in a more developed area, therefore, the development cut @ 45% is required to be applied for providing space for infrastructure development, development expenditure and the waiting period, whereas, the deduction @ 10% is required to be applied due to the comparatively smaller area.

3.3 Per contra, the learned counsel representing the State has submitted that the sale deed No. 2306, 2307, 2308 and 2309 dated 09.06.2006 is part of the acquired land and therefore, the market value was around ₹15,00,000/- per acre, whereas the LAC has awarded @ ₹20,00,000/- per acre.

3.4 The learned counsel representing the parties have also filed their written synopsis along with the gist of their submissions.

4. **DISCUSSION BY THIS COURT**

4.1 Since a comprehensive layout plan was not available to examine the comparative geographical location of the acquired land vis-a-vis the various parcels of the land represented by the sale deeds, with the consent of the parties, the Patwari of the area was requested to prepare a layout plan, which has been produced and marked as Ex. HC-1.

4.2 At this stage, firstly, it would be appropriate to examine the various reasons recorded by the RC. The RC has ignored the sale deeds (Ex.R6 to Ex.R13) on the ground that these sale deeds reflect the price lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. The RC has held that in view of Section 25 of the 1894 Act, the aforesaid sale instances cannot be considered. The RC while relying upon the various sale instances bearing No. 928, 1182, 1302, 1441, 3067, 3498, 7840, 10004, 10010 and 10157, arrived at a figure of ₹56,68,177/- per acre. After applying the deduction @ 55%, on various counts, the RC has assessed the market value of the acquired land @ 25,50,680/-.

4.3 As regards the first reason assigned by the RC to ignore the sale exemplars produced by the State, it would be noted that the RC has misread Section 25 of the 1894 Act. It would be noted here that Section 25 of the 1894 Act only bars the Court from assessing the market value lower than the value assessed by the LAC. However, there is no bar in taking into consideration the various sale exemplars reflecting the price lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. This matter has been, comprehensively, decided by the Supreme Court in ***Lal Chand v. Union of India and Others (2009) 15 SCC 769***. Hence, this issue is no longer *res integra*.

4.4 The RC has also committed an error in calculating per acre average price of the various sale exemplars noted above. The RC has also committed an error in deducting 55% from the base value, arrived at after averaging the per acre price of the various sale deeds. In the considered view of this Court, once the comparable sale instances of contemporaneous period are available, then there was no occasion to apply the development cut.

4.5 On a careful examination of the layout plan (Ex. HC-1), it is evident that the State of Haryana has acquired the land out of rectangle No. 104, 105, 106, 126 and 128. In terms of unit of the land, a rectangle means 25 acres of land in a rectangular shape. It is also evident that the sale deed No. 3067 dated 03.07.2006 is with respect to the land comprised in rectangle No. 102 and 103, whereas, the sale deed No.2718 (21.06.2006) is with respect to the land sold from rectangle No. 101. It is also evident that the sale deed No. 7840 dated 08.12.2006 is out of the land comprised in rectangle No. 93, 128, 102, 103 and 129. Through this sale exemplar, 1 acre of the land has been sold @ ₹45,00,000/- per acre. As per the sale deed No. 3067, the land measuring 10 kanals and 9.88 marlas was sold @ ₹43,40,003/- per acre. Through the sale deed No. 2718, the land measuring 23 kanals and 12 marlas was sold @ ₹43,00,000/- per acre. Thus, it is evident that the price of the land of various plots was ranging from ₹43,00,000/- to ₹45,00,000/- per acre. The remaining sale deeds, produced by the landowners, are not with respect to the parcels of land situated in a comparable geographical location.

4.6 It is also evident that the water works is planned to be constructed in the parcel of the land, which is very much a part of Sector 34, Rohtak. This sector is reserved for residential purposes. The various sale exemplars, produced by the landowners, are comparable. It would be noted here that the State has produced the various sale exemplars including the sale deed No. 2306, 2307, 2308 and 2309, which were all executed on 09.06.2006. All these sale exemplars are with respect to 1 kanals of land each. The vendor, in all these sale deeds, is common. These are very small parcels of the land when compared to the acquired land. There is another sale exemplar, produced by the State, i.e. 3857 dated 31.07.2006, whereas, the land measuring 11 marlas has been sold. It would be noted here that this sale exemplar is also with respect to a very small parcel of land, hence, not comparable with the acquired land.

4.7 Moreover, the landowners are entitled to the maximum price as their land had been acquired compulsorily. The sale exemplar dated 08.12.2006 is executed only a few days before the date of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The land measuring 1 acre has been sold from the land comprised in rectangle No. 93, 128, 102, 103 and 129. A bare look at the layout plan (Ex.HC-1) shows that some part of the acquired land is from the rectangle No. 128. There is also no evidence to prove that there was a significant difference in the prices of the land with respect to the nearby area. The various sale exemplars, produced by the landowners, are, in fact, of the land, which has been developed for residential purposes in Sector 34. In such circumstances, the sale exemplar No. 7840 is considered appropriate for assessing the market value of the acquired land. Since the aforesaid sale exemplar is of the land measuring 1 acre, which has been purchased @ ₹45,00,000/- per acre, therefore, the market value of the acquired land is also assessed @ ₹45,00,000/- per acre.

4.8 As regards the question of the development cut, this matter has been examined at length in the case of ***Jai Singh vs. State of Haryana and others (Regular First Appeal No.3000 of 2016, decided on 15.11.2021)***. The relevant discussion is as under:-

> *"7.14 The principle underlined by all these judgments is that while assessing the market value, the court is required to apply the wisdom of a common man and arrive at a figure which a willing seller will get from a voluntary purchaser for the property. Once the market value of the acquired agricultural land is being assessed and many sales exemplars of considerably big sized plots of the agricultural land are available, the application of cut/deduction for development, in the considered opinion of the Court, is not justified unless the court is assessing the market value of a land where the sale exemplars produced before the Court are of relatively small sized plots or are being used for residential, commercial or industrial purposes. The deduction can be applied when comparable sale exemplar is of a plot of a very small size as compared to the acquired land in order to moderate the difference between wholesale and retail prices as observed by the Supreme court in judgment passed in* ***LaL Chand (supra)****. The appropriate percentage of cut can also be applied if the*

sale exemplar is of a plot which was being used or was capable of being used for different purposes like residential, commercial or industrial. The development cut can also be applied when the comparable sale exemplar is of a plot which is located at a key position like near the road, market, developed residential colony or commercial establishments. There can be more than one reasons to apply the development cut. However, if the price is reduced while assessing the market value of the acquired land, without observing the aforesaid principles while making the deduction in the facts and circumstances of the individual cases, it shall be against the statutory intendment. In a case where the court is making an assessment with respect to an undeveloped acquired land as an undeveloped area and the sale exemplar produced for such determination is also of an undeveloped piece of land of reasonable size, then any deduction which is made on account of development work or development cost, in the considered opinion of this Court, shall not be considered appropriate. This can be explained by an example. Hypothetically, if a farmer purchases a sufficiently large chunk of land just before the notification under Section 4. On the acquisition of the land purchased, he is likely to produce the sale exemplar of the land purchased by him. If the court treats the sale exemplar as the base value and thereafter applies a cut or deduction on account of development cut or development cost per se, he shall stand deprived of the market *value paid by him while purchasing the land. It would be against the spirit/intention of the Act. While assessing the market value of the undeveloped/agricultural land, the court is not required to work out the market value of the developed land or plot. In such circumstances, the application of development cut in the considered opinion of the court would not be appropriate and justified. The cut/deduction is applied by the courts in order to arrive at a correct figure representing the true market value of the acquired land on the relevant date. This method has been devised by the Courts in order to tide over the situations where exactly comparable sale exemplars of contemporaneous period are not available. The court, while making adjustments or treating the prices of the developed plots of smaller size as the base, endeavours to work out the fair market value of the acquired land.*

7.15 This matter can be examined from another angle. The intention of the legislature is not to put the landowners who stand deprived of the land through double whammy. On the one hand, their immovable property is compulsorily taken away, whereas on the other hand, they are not being compensated adequately due to the deduction towards the development. This cannot be the intention of the legislature. The fundamental intention of the Legislature has always been to make the land laws fair, just and reasonable towards the sufferers of compulsory land acquisition.

7.16 Once a large chunk of agricultural land is being acquired for carving out a residential/commercial or industrial colony and the sale exemplars of plots of reasonable size of agricultural land are available, then in the considered opinion of this Court, it would not be appropriate to apply a development cut for the purpose of assessment either towards development cost or towards the area to be used for passages, roads, drains, parks etc. The landowner stands in the shoes of a loser even if some part of the acquired land is being used for providing common facilities. The landowner does not gain anything exclusively on account of reservation of land for common facilities. In fact, the landowner suffers a dual loss. On the one hand, he is deprived of the acquired land and on the other hand, he does not receive a fair and appropriate amount towards the involuntary deprivation.

7.17 There is yet another aspect of the matter. The development agency/organization/colonizer or the government do not sell the developed plots on the market value assessed by the court. The plots are sold while determining price on basis of the demand and supply. Usually, the plots are sold on the basis of price determined on per sq. feet or per sq. yard. basis and not on per acre. Therefore, certain percentage of land utilized for carrying out development activities like passages, roads, drains, parks etc. is to be accounted for by the developer and not the landowner. Therefore, in the considered view of this

> *Court, the development cost incurred or to be incurred for providing common facilities is also required to be borne by the developer. 7.18 It is well settled that while assessing the market value, the court is required to adopt a pragmatic approach. The landowners who stand deprived of the property cannot be permitted to be denied of an adequate and just compensation as well. This is the responsibility of the courts to see that the landowners are adequately compensated. The learned counsel representing the parties have failed to draw the attention of the court to any precedent which lays down that while assessing the market value, the application of development cut or deduction on the base value is mandatory."*

4.9 As regards the entitlement of the landowners to get the maximum price, this Court, while deciding a batch of appeals in ***M/s Satkartar Realtors Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of Haryana and others (Regular First Appeal No.458 of 2016, decided on 02.03.2022)*** after relying upon the various judgments, passed by the Supreme Court, has held as under:-

> *"6.10 Further, it is by now well settled that the landowners are entitled to the highest price fetched by the various owners of comparable sale deed during contemporaneous period. Reliance in this regard can be placed on the following observations made in* ***M. Vijayalakshmamma Rao Bahadur v. Collector 1969 Madras Law Journal, 45 (SC)****:-*
>
> > *"46-47 It seems to us that there is substance in the first contention of Mr Ram Reddy. After all when the land*

is being compulsorily taken away from a person, he is entitled to say that he should be given the highest value which similar land in the locality is shown to have fetched in a bona fide transaction entered into between a willing purchaser and a willing seller near about the time of the acquisition. It is not disputed that the transaction represented by Ext. R-19 was a few months prior to the notification under Section 4 that it was a bona fide transaction and that it was entered into between a willing purchaser and a willing seller. The land comprised in the sale deed is 11 grounds and was sold at Rs. 1961 per ground. The land covered by Ext. R27 was also sold before the notification but after the land comprised in Ext. R-19 was sold. It is true that this land was sold at Rs. 1096 per ground. This, however, is apparently because of two circumstances. One is that betterment levy at Rs. 500 per ground had to be paid by the vendee and the other that the land comprised in it is very much more extensive, that is about 93 grounds or so. Whatever that may be, it seems to us to be only fair that where sale deeds pertaining to different transactions are relied on behalf of the Government, that representing the highest value should be preferred to the rest unless there are strong circumstances justifying a different course. In any case we see no reason why an average of *two sale deeds should have been taken in this case.*

6.11 Similarly, while deciding ***Anjani Molu Dessai vs. State of Goa 2010 (13) SCC 710****, the Supreme Court, once again, reinterated the same principle in the following manner:-*

> *20. The legal position is that even where there are several exemplars with reference to similar lands, usually the highest of the exemplars, which is a bona fide transaction, will be considered. Where however there are several sales of similar lands whose prices range in a narrow bandwidth, the average thereof can be taken, as representing the market price. But where the values disclosed in respect of two sales are markedly different, it can only lead to an inference that they are with reference to dissimilar lands or that the lower value sale is on account of undervaluation or other price depressing reasons. Consequently, averaging cannot be resorted to. We may refer to two decisions of this Court in this behalf.*

6.12 In ***Mehrawal Khewaji Trust's case (supra)****, it has been held as under:-*

> *"17. It is clear that when there are several exemplars with reference to similar lands, it is the general rule that the highest of the exemplars, if it is satisfied that it is a bona fide transaction, has to be considered and accepted. When the land is being compulsorily taken away from a person, he is entitled to the highest value*

which similar land in the locality is shown to have fetched in a bona fide transaction entered into between a willing purchaser and a willing seller near about the time of the acquisition. In our view, it seems to be only fair that where sale deeds pertaining to different transactions are relied on behalf of the Government, the transaction representing the highest value should be preferred to the rest unless there are strong circumstances justifying a different course. It is not desirable to take an average of various sale deeds placed before the authority/court for fixing fair compensation."

5. DECISION

5.1 In view thereof, the appeals, filed by the landowners, are allowed, whereas the appeals, filed by the State of Haryana, are hereby dismissed.

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

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

March 25, 2022
"DK"

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

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party Name
1.	RFA-1041-2017	M/S Pushpak Realtors Pvt Ltd vs. State Of Haryana And Others
2.	RFA-67-2017	State Of Haryana Through Collector Rohtak And Ors vs. M/S Pushpak Realtors Pvt. Ltd.
3.	RFA-10662-2014	Nafe Singh & Ors vs. State Of Haryana & Ors
4.	RFA-1214-2016	Jai Pal And Ors vs. State Of Haryana And Ors

5.	RFA-8478-2014	State Of Haryana & Ors vs. Harpal Singh
6.	RFA-8490-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Sukhbir Thr Gp Holder
7.	RFA-8480-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Manphool Singh & Ors
8.	RFA-8485-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Satpal And Ors
9.	RFA-8494-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Surender Singh And Ors
10.	RFA-7327-2015	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Smt Leechhmi Devi and Ors
11.	RFA-6508-2015	Surender Singh & Ors vs. State Of Haryana Anr
12.	RFA-8481-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Attar Singh & Ors
13.	RFA-8487-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Satbir Singh & Ors
14.	RFA-8495-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Smt. Vidya Wati And Anr
15.	RFA-8916-2014	Raj Rati (DECEASED) Thr Lr & Ors vs. State Of Haryana & Ors
16.	RFA-8917-2014	Smt. Vidyawati vs. State Of Haryana & Anr
17.	RFA-8496-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Manoj Kumar & Ors
18.	RFA-8479-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Om Parkash And Ors
19.	RFA-8483-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Dilbagh Singh
20.	RFA-8484-2014	State Of Haryana & Ors vs. Vidyawati
21.	RFA-8913-2014	Ram Kanwar & Ors vs. State Of Haryana& Ors
22.	RFA-8914-2014	Om Parkash & Ors vs. State Of Haryana& Anr
23.	RFA-8477-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Ram Kanwar & Ors
24.	RFA-8486-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Virender Singh
25.	RFA-8489-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Jai Pal & Ors
26.	RFA-8493-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Suresh Kumar
27.	RFA-8482-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Devender And Ors
28.	RFA-8491-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. M/S Harihar Buildcon Pvt Ltd & Ors
29.	RFA-8492-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Rajender And Ors
30.	RFA-9100-2014	Virender Singh vs. State Of Haryana & Anr
31.	RFA-8915-2014	Rajender vs. State Of Haryana& Ors
32.	RFA-5449-2014	Manphool Singh & Anr vs. State Of Haryana & Ors
33.	RFA-7326-2015	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Nafe Singh And Ors
34.	RFA-2786-2016	Dilbag Singh vs. State Of Haryana And Anr
35.	RFA-2787-2016	Smt. Vidyawati And Anr vs. State Of Haryana And Anr
36.	RFA-8488-2014	State Of Haryana & Anr vs. Smt. Bedo Devi And Anr

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

March 25, 2022
"DK"