

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

XOBJR-101-2022 in/and
RFA-1895-2016 (O&M)
Reserved on: 16.09.2022
Date of decision: 21.09.2022

RATTAN LAL AND OTHERS

..Appellants

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Shailendra Jain, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Jagtar Singh, Advocate

Mr. Sunil Chadha, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Saurav Kanojia, Advocate
Ms. Kashish Aggarwal, Advocate

Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate
Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate
Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
Mr. Rose Gupta, Advocate
Ms. Garima, Advocate
Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate
Mr. Manish Kumar Singla, Advocate
Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Arvind Singh, Advocate
for Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate
Mr. P.K. Sandhir, Advocate
Mr. Ajay Jain, Advocate
for the landowners.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 This batch of appeals, cross-appeals, cross-objections (details
whereof are at the foot of the judgment) has been filed by the landowners as
well as the State of Haryana with a prayer to modify the award passed by the

Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the RC'). The notification under Section 4, 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as 'the LAC'), is common. By two different awards passed by the RC, identical market value of the acquired land has been assessed. The learned counsel representing the parties are *ad idem* that this batch of appeals can conveniently be disposed of by a common judgment.

1.2 The relevant particulars of this batch of appeals are as under:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Relevant Date
1.	Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued proposing to acquire land for development of commercial Sector 25, Hisar.	31.03.2008
2.	Declaration under Section 6	03.02.2009
3.	Vide award No.8, the LAC offered to pay the market value at the rate of Rs.60,00,000/- per acre for the land falling on Delhi-Hisar-Sirsa Bypass Road upto the depth of 2 acres, whereas, the landowners were offered Rs.50,00,000/- per acre for the remaining land in the interiors. The acquired land falls in the revenue estates of villages Hisar and Satrod.	27.01.2011
4.	While deciding 84 reference petitions filed by the landowners, the RC assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.92,38,253/- per acre (1908.73 per square yard).	28.01.2016
5.	The RC by a separate judgment has decided another bunch of reference petitions, assessing the same market value i.e. Rs.92,38,253/- per acre.	04.01.2019

1.3 While explaining the potentiality of the acquired land, the landowners have claimed that the acquired land is located on the National Highway No-10 (hereinafter referred to as 'the NH-10') as well as within the municipal limits of Hisar City. It is claimed that famous automobile companies such as Hyundai, Honda etc. have opened their showrooms near the acquired land. The Railways has also constructed a new railway station in the year 1987 which is located in the middle of the acquired land. Besides the aforesaid, the acquired land is also surrounded by various colonies namely Mahavir Colony, DCM, Government Colony, Jawahar Nagar, Adarsh Nagar etc. Residential and commercial Sectors 1 and 4, developed by the Haryana Urban Development Authority in the year 1995-96, are situated adjacent to the acquired land. The compensation was also claimed for tubewells as well as trees existing on the acquired land.

1.4 On the other hand, the State of Haryana contested the petitions while claiming that the LAC has assessed fair and proper compensation while announcing the award.

1.5 On appreciation of the pleadings, the following issues were culled out:-

*“1. What was the market value of the acquired land at the time of publication of Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 and as to whether petitioner/petitioners is/are entitled to compensation as prayed and to what extent? OPP
2. Relief”*

2. EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE PARTIES

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

<i>PW-1</i>	<i>Rajinder Parsad</i>
<i>PW-3</i>	<i>Dayanad</i>
<i>PW-4</i>	<i>Dayanad</i>
<i>PW-5</i>	<i>Sukhdev</i>
<i>PW-5</i>	<i>Sukhdev</i>
<i>PW-6</i>	<i>Parduman</i>
<i>PW-7</i>	<i>Vijay Kumar</i>
<i>PW-8</i>	<i>Mahender Singh, Draftsman</i>
<i>PW-9</i>	<i>Babu Ram, Assistant</i>
<i>PW-10</i>	<i>Surender Kumar, Building Clerk</i>
<i>PW-11</i>	<i>Prem Singh, Clerk</i>
<i>PW-12</i>	<i>Inder Singh,Tracer</i>
<i>PW-13</i>	<i>Sarjit, Patwari</i>
<i>PW-14</i>	<i>Jitender Jain</i>

2.2 In documentary evidence, the landowners also produced the following documentary evidence in support of their case:-

<i>Ex.P1</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.5381 dated 12.02.2008 of Hansi-I regarding land measuring 16 Kanal 05 Marla i.e. 9831 sq. yard, market value Rs.49/- per sq. yard.</i>
<i>Ex.P2</i>	<i>Map of Cable Route laid by BSNL to provide telephone facilities to the inhabitants of Mirzapur-Raipur Road in Sector 25, Hisar. It has been proved by PW5 Shri Jai Narain, SDO, BSNL Department, Hisar. BSNL has provided telephone connections up to By-pass shown in red colour in the site plan</i>
<i>Ex.P3</i>	<i>Site Plan of acquired land prepared and proved by PW8 Mohinder Singh, Draftsman (Civil), Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.P4</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No. 9847 dt. 9-1-2007 Area: 34 Kanal 4 Marla of village Satrod Khas i.e. 20691 sq. yards and market value Rs.5515.38 per sq. yard as on 9-1-2007. This sale deed has been proved by PW11 Shri Prem Singh , Clerk , office of Sub - Registrar , Hisar</i>

<i>Ex.P5</i>	<i>Auction of 19 commercial sites/plots DSS UE-II, measuring 1580.5 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 25-02-2002. Total auction money comes to Rs. 2,33,99,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs. 14804.25/- per sq . yard</i>
<i>Ex.P6</i>	<i>Auction of 13 commercial sites/plots SCF UE-II, measuring 1597.2 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 15-03-2002. Total auction money comes to Rs. 2,11,09,000/i.e. average rate of Rs.13216.25 per sq. yard.</i>
<i>Ex.P7</i>	<i>Auction of 8 commercial sites/plots SCF UE-II, measuring 767.5 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 8-5-2002 . Total auction money comes to Rs.1,00,72,516/- i.e. average rate of Rs.13123.80 per sq. yard.</i>
<i>Ex.P8</i>	<i>Auction of 4 commercial sites/plots SCF UE-II, measuring 532.40 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh. Babu Lal on 26-06-2002. Total auction money comes to Rs . 94,66,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.17780.00 per sq. yard .</i>
<i>Ex.P9</i>	<i>Auction of 4 commercial sites/plots SCF UE-II, measuring 399.3 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh. Babu Lal on 24-07-2002. Total auction money comes to Rs.73,28,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.18352.10 per sq. yard</i>
<i>Ex.P10</i>	<i>Auction of 2 commercial sites/plots SSB UE-II, measuring 63.36 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 7-8-2008 . Total auction money comes to Rs.67,50,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.1,06,534/- per sq. yard</i>
<i>Ex.P10</i>	<i>Auction of 1 commercial sites/plots SSB UE-II, measuring 63.36 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 7-8-2008. Total auction money comes to Rs.61,21,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.96,606/- per sq. yard</i>
<i>Ex.P10</i>	<i>Auction of 1 commercial sites/plots SSB</i>

	<i>UE-II, measuring 60.44 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 7-8-2008. Total auction money comes to Rs.1,00,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.1,65,453/- per sq. yard</i>
<i>Ex.P11</i>	<i>Auction of 3 commercial sites/plots SSF UE-II, measuring 332.00 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 18-12-2008. Total auction money comes to Rs.2,90,80,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.87,590/- per sq . yard</i>
<i>Ex.P11</i>	<i>Auction of 4 commercial sites/plots SSB UE-II, measuring 126.72 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh . Babu Lal on 18-12-2008. Total auction money comes to Rs.1,12,10,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.80,462.71/- per sq . yard.</i>
<i>Ex.P12</i>	<i>Auction of 3 commercial sites/plots SSO UE-II, measuring 330.00 sq. yards conducted by HUDA and proved by PW9 Sh. Babu Lal on 16-02-2010. Total auction money comes to Rs.3,27,83,000/- i.e. average rate of Rs.9,342/40 per sq. yard</i>
<i>Ex.P12</i>	<i>Original Development Plan of Sector 15, Hisar at serial No. 25 by Mark "A" proved by PW-12 Sh. Inder Singh, Tracer office of DTC, Hisar 7-12-2015</i>
<i>Ex.P13</i>	<i><u>Sajra Plans</u> of Sectors 1-4, 3-5 adjacent to Sector 25 towards its western side proved by PW-12 Sh. Inder Singh, Tracer office of DTC, Hisar on 7-12 2015</i>
<i>Ex.P14</i>	<i><u>Sajra Plan</u> of Sector 3 and 5 By-pass of National Highway No.10 towards its eastern side of the land acquired for Sector 25, Raipur Road is towards northern side of land acquired for Sector 25 proved by PW-12 Sh . Inder Singh, Tracer office of DTC, Hisar on 7-12-2015</i>
<i>Ex.P15</i>	<i>Site Plan of Sector 1-4, 3-5, 1-4 Raipur Road and Sector 25 situated at Hisar showing the blue colour acquired for Sector 25 Hisar. Raipur and with Road Sector with green colour , Sector 1-4 with light purple colour and Sector 3 & 5 shown with grey colour proved by <u>PW-13</u></i>

	<i>Sh. Sarjit Patwari, office of LAC Hisar on 7-12-2015.</i>
<i>Ex.P16</i>	<i>Notification No.LAC(H)-NTLA- 2003/245 dated 19-05-2003 under Sec. 4 of the Act vide which it has been proposed to acquire 74.67 acres of land situated in the revenue estate of village Hisar H.B. No.146, Tehsil and District Hisar for a public purpose namely for the development and utilization as residential and commercial area called Raipur Road Sector proved by PW-13 Sh. Sarjit Patwari, office of LAC Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.P17</i>	<i>Notification No. LAC (H)-2003/270 dated 14-05 2004 under Sec. 6 of the Act vide which 68.44 acres of land has notified to be acquired and proved by PW-13 Sh. Sarjit Patwari, office of LAC Hisar for residential and commercial area of Raipur Road sector.</i>
<i>Ex.P18</i>	<i>Certified copy of Award No. 13 dated 12-05-2006 for acquiring the land measuring 55.53 acres for Raipur Road Sector, Hisar has been announced by Shri Ram Nath, HCS, Land Acq . Collector and proved by PW-13 Sh. Sarjit Patwari, office of LAC Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.P19</i>	<i>Certified copy of judgment dated 19-03-2015 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh enhancing the compensation @ Rs.1100.19 per sq. yard for Raipur Road sector acquired vide Notification dated 19-05-2003 (Ex.P16) issued u/s 4 of the Act.</i>
<i>Ex.P20</i>	<i>Certified copy of rapat Roznamcha No.383 dated 12-05-2006 proved by PW13 Shri Sarjit Singh Patwari , office of Land Acq. Collector, Hisar regarding Raipur Road Sector Hisar vide which possession of land was taken.</i>
<i>Ex.P21</i>	<i>Certified copy of Award No. 1 dated 19-01-1995 of 227.44 acres announced by Shri R.K. Kajal, Land Acquisition Collector, Hisar regarding Sector 1-4, Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.P22</i>	<i>Certified copy of Notification No.LAC (H)-NTLA 2002/236 dated 13-11-2002 under Section 4 of the Act pertaining to</i>

	<i>development and utilization of land as residential and commercial area for <u>Sector No. 3-5</u>, Hisar regarding 368.53 acres.</i>
<i>Ex.P23</i>	<i>Certified copy of Notification No. LAC (H)-NTLA 2003/254 dated 10-11-2003 under Section 6 of the Act pertaining to development and utilization of land as residential and commercial area for Sector 3-5, Hisar regarding 367.80 acres.</i>
<i>Ex.P24</i>	<i>Certified copy of Award No. 9 dated 08-11-2005 pertaining to development and utilization of land as residential and commercial area for Sector 3-5, Hisar regarding land announced by Shri Acquisition Collector, Hisar measuring 333.36 acres Ram Nath, HCS, Land Acquisition Collector, Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.P25</i>	<i>Certified copy of <u>judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India</u> dated 22-08-2014 enhancing the compensation to Rs . 1039.67 per sq . yard relating to the land of <u>Sector 3-5 in case titled as Narbadi Devi etc.</u> vs State of Haryana etc.</i>
<i>Ex.P26</i>	<i>Certified copy of judgment passed by Hon'ble High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana, Chandigarh dated 19-03-2015 enhancing the compensation to Rs.1100.19 per sq. yard relating to the land of Raipur Road Sector Hisar in case titled as Narender Kumar etc. vs State of Haryana etc.</i>
<i>Ex.P27</i>	<i>Certified copy of judgment dated 30-03-2011 passed by Shri Gulab Singh, Additional District Judge, Hisar enhancing the compensation to Rs. 670 per sq. yard relating to the land acquired for road through UE - II , Vidyut Nagar , Sector 3-5 and Sector 1-4 in case titled as Hari Singh etc. vs State of Haryana etc.</i>
<i>Ex.P28</i>	<i>Certified copy of judgment dated 31-05-2011 passed by Shri H.S Dahiya , Hon'ble Additional District Judge, Hisar enhancing the compensation to Rs.710/- per sq. yard relating to the land of Raipur Road Sector in case titled as Ajay Chaudhary etc. vs State of Haryana etc.</i>
<i>Ex.P29</i>	<i>Certified copy of judgment dated 09-08-</i>

	<i>2010 passed by Shri Gulab Singh , Hon'ble Additional District Judge, Hisar enhancing the compensation to Rs.670/- per sq . yard relating to the land of Sector 3-5, Hisar in case titled as Ram Avtar etc. vs State of Haryana etc.</i>
<i>Ex.P30</i>	<i>Certified copy of judgment passed by Hon'ble High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana, Chandigarh , dated 26-03-2014 enhancing the compensation to Rs.724.75 per sq. yard relating to the land of Sector 3-5 at Hisar in case titled as State of Haryana etc. Vs Murti Devi on which the case RFA No.5626 of 2010 is based.</i>

2.3 In additional evidence, during the pendency of this batch of appeals, the landowners have produced the following documents:-

- 1. Certified copy of the order dated 16.09.2016 in CWP-9718-2009, titled as “Vivek Cooperative House Building Society Ltd. Vs. State of Haryana and others; (Ex.HC-2)*
- 2. Copy of order dated 26.03.2019 & 22.10.2019 in COCP-3297-2017, titled as “Sant Singh Vs. Arun Gupta and others”; and, (Ex.HC-3 and HC-4)*
- 3. Copy of sale deed Vasika No.7385 dated 04.11.2019 (Ex.HC-5).*

2.4 On the other hand, in oral evidence, the State of Haryana examined Sh. Sita Ram, Patwari as RW-1.

2.5 In documentary evidence, the following documents were produced by the State of Haryana:-

<i>Ex.R1 631-647</i>	<i>Certified copy of Award No.8 dated 27.01.2011 in respect of land measuring 273.27 acres by Shri Surjan Singh, HSC, Land Acquisition Collector, Hisar regarding</i>
--------------------------	---

	<i>the Land falling on National Highway No.10 up to the depth of two acres at the rate of Rs.60.00 lac per acre i.e. Rs.1239.66 sq. yard and Rs.50.00 lac per acre for all kinds of land i.e. Rs.1033.05 per sq. yard proved by RW1 Sh. Sita Ram Patwari, office of LAC, Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R2 693-699</i>	<i>Notification No.LAC(H)-2008-NTLA/416 dated 31-03-2008 u/s 4 of the Act regarding the Area proposed to be acquired i.e 303.76 acre for public purpose namely for commercial area of Sector 25 Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R3 701-707</i>	<i>Notification under Section 6 of the Act bearing No.LAC(H)-2008/468 dated 3-2-2009 pertaining to the Area measuring 280.44 acres needed to be acquired for the aforesaid purpose and proved by RW1 Sh. Sita Ram, Patwari, office of LAC, Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R4 709</i>	<i>Copy of list of sale deeds</i>
<i>Ex.R5 711-714</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.4071 dated 25.08.2009 amounting to Rs.14,06,500/- for an area of 4 Kanal 10 Marla of Hisar outside of MC area.</i>
<i>Ex.R6 715-718</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.8985 dated 12.12.2008 amounting to Rs.25,00,000/- for an area of 08 Kanal of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R7 719-722</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.7809 dated 07.11.2008 amounting to Rs.23,12,500/- for an area of 07 Kanal 08 Marla of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R8 723-726</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.15224 dated 31.03.2006 amounting to Rs.21,66,000/- for an area of 24 Kanal 15 Marla of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R9 727-737</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.6468 dated 26.11.2009 amounting to Rs.1,17,00,000/- for an area of 24 Kanal 04 Marla of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R10 739-742</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.11545 dated 22.01.2008 amounting to Rs.25,00,000/- for an area of 27 Kanal 14 Marla of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R11 743-746</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.11761 dated 28.01.2008 amounting to Rs.6,19,000/- for an area of 03 Kanal 03 Marla outside of MC area of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R12 741-744</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.13323 dated 05.03.2008 amounting to Rs.4,69,000/- for an area of 02 Kanal 10 Marla outside of MC</i>

	<i>area of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R13 745-748</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.11661 dated 27.02.2009 amounting to Rs.15,00,000/- for an area of 04 Kanal of Hisar.</i>
<i>Ex.R14 749-752</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.3382 dated 04.07.2008 amounting to Rs.5,62,500/- for an area of 03 Kanal of village Satrod Kalan.</i>
<i>Ex.R15 753-756</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.1193 dated 05.05.2008 amounting to Rs.19,68,750/- for an area of 15 Kanal 15 Marla of village Satrod Kalan.</i>
<i>Ex.R16 757-760</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.2835 dated 10.07.2009 amounting to Rs.81,00,000/- for an area of 50 Kanal 02 Marla of Satrod Kalan.</i>
<i>Ex.R17 761-764</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.13513 dated 30.03.2007 amounting to Rs.27,00,000/- for an area of 07 Kanal 06 Marla of village Satrod Kalan.</i>
<i>Ex.R18 765-769</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.9451 dated 29.11.2007 amounting to Rs.1,20,00,000/- for an area of 31 Kanal 01 Marla of village Satrod Kalan.</i>
<i>Ex.R18 771-774</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.4516 dated 09.09.2009 amounting to Rs.9,00,000/- for an area of 04 Kanal 16 Marla of village Satrod Kalan.</i>
<i>Ex.R19 775-778</i>	<i>Certified copy of sale deed No.1636 dated 02.06.2009 amounting to Rs.28,92,500/- for an area of 20 Kanal of village Satrod Kalan.</i>
<i>Ex.R20</i>	<i>Certified copy of Aksajra of Sector 25 proved by Sh. Sita Ram Patwari of LAC Office, Hisar on 16.12.2015</i>

2.6 In response to the additional evidence produced by the landowners, the State of Haryana has produced a layout plan Ex.HC-1.

3. The RC decided as many as 84 reference petitions vide its award dated 28.01.2017. It was held that the acquired land is in the vicinity of Sector 1-4, 3-5 and is abutting NH-10. Thus, the Court while escalating the market value at the rate of 12% per annum assessed by the Court for

acquisition of the land for Sector 1 to 4, Raipur Road, held that the landowners are entitled to the market value at the rate of Rs.1908.73/- per square yard along with all the statutory benefits.

4. This Bench has heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the judgments passed by the RC as well as the record of the RC, which was requisitioned.

5. On the one hand, the learned counsel representing the landowners have contended that the land measuring 34 kanals and 4 marlas has been purchased by the State of Haryana at the rate of Rs.2,66,94,473/- per acre vide sale deed No.7385 dated 04.11.2019 (Ex.HC-5) for a total consideration of Rs.10,74,76,896/-. This parcel of land was not only part of the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act issued on 31.03.2008, but also is located in village Sarsod Khas. They contend that out of the originally planned land for acquisition of Sector 25, Hisar itself, the Government has purchased a parcel of land from one of the owner at the rate of Rs.2795/- per square yard. It is submitted that the appellants are entitled to the same rate as the aforesaid purchased parcel of land is comprised in Sector 25, Hisar. In the alternative, the learned counsel representing the landowners contends that from the oral evidence, it is proved at the time of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, the entire area had the potential to be developed into a commercial area, therefore, its assessment, as an agricultural land, by the RC is not appropriate.

6. Per contra, the learned counsel representing the respondent, while drawing the attention of the Court to layout plan, contends that the award passed by the LAC is required to be upheld, particularly when it is

proved from the perusal of sale instances, Ex.R-5, R-6 and R-11, that the land was being sold at the rate of around Rs.25,00,000/- per acre, though, the LAC had offered Rs.60,00,000/- per acre with respect to the belt of the land abutting NH-10, whereas, the market value of the land located in the interiors from the road beyond the depth of 2 acres, has been assessed at the rate of Rs.50,00,000/- per acre.

7. DISCUSSION BY THIS COURT

7.1 It is evident that RC placed reliance on the assessment of the market value of a different parcel of land acquired for development of Section 1 and 4, Raipur Road by a separate notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 19.03.2003, by the High Court in *Narender Kumar and others Vs. State of Haryana and others, Regular First No.5916 of 2011, decided on 19.03.2015*. The RC held that the sale deeds Ex.R-5 to R-9, (relied upon by the State) are not relevant as these pertain to the land located outside the municipal area of Hisar. Sale deed No.15224 dated 31.03.2006, was ignored on the ground that it was executed in the year 2006, whereas, sale deed No.6468 dated 26.11.2009, in respect to 24 kanals and 4 marlas was ignored being subsequent to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Remaining sale deeds were ignored on the ground that these represents a small parcels of land when compared with the acquired land.

7.2 Before proceeding further, it is appropriate to analyse the reasons recorded by the RC. As already noticed, the RC did not rely upon any sale deed, though, the landowners as well as the State produced as many as 18 sale deeds. The Court chose to rely upon the market value assessed by the High Court as on 19.05.2003. In that judgment, the Court after taking

into consideration the gap of nearly five years i.e. between 19.05.2003 to 31.03.2008, held that the landowners shall be entitled to cumulative escalation at the rate of 12% per annum and assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.1,908.73/- per square yard. This Court has carefully read the judgment (Ex.P-26) passed in **Narender Kumar's case (supra)**. By this judgment, the Court assessed the market value of the land on the basis of the assessment made by the Supreme Court in **Ashrafi and others Vs. State of Haryana and others, AIR 2013 SC 3654**. In that case, the Court, while taking a note of the time period that had elapsed between the notifications under Section 4 in the case of Ashrafi Devi as well as **Narender Kumar's case (supra)**, awarded a cumulative increase for a period of 10 years and 9 months, while calculating the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.1100.19/- per square yard.

7.3 Thus, it is obvious that in **Narender Kumar's case (Supra)**, the market value was assessed on the basis of estimations/projections/assumptions. In considered view of this Court, while assessing the market value, the Court should not resort to assumptions as a thumb rule, particularly when comparable sale deeds have been produced by the parties. The calculation of 12% or 10% cumulative increase for a period of nearly 11 years is in the realm of imagination. The experience shows that usually the increase in the price is not likely to be in a straight line. It depends upon various factors including the geographical location, potential of the land, nature. If the land is used for commercial or residential purposes and there is development in the area, the prices are likely to increase more steeply. While assessing the market value of the acquired land, the Court is

required to look for the appropriate sale exemplar between a willing seller and a willing buyer.

7.4 This matter has been elaborately discussed in **Regular First Appeal No.684 of 2021, titled as “Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited Vs. Mahender Singh and others”, decided on 14.10.2021**, the relevant part whereof is extracted as under:-

9.14 This issue is no longer res-integra. Recently, in **Manoj Kumar etc. vs. State of Haryana and others (2018) 13 SCC 96**, the Supreme Court has held that while assessing the market value, the Court is required to evaluate the various factors which goes to impact such a determination depending upon the peculiar facts governing each case. There cannot be any hard or fast rule for assessment of the market value. Common sense is the best and most reliable guide. While denouncing the practice of the courts to place an outright reliance on the previous judgments, the Supreme Court has declared that the decision cannot be applied ipso facto to the facts of the subsequent cases neglecting the other evidence. The Court has further warned of the ill effects of such an approach. The relevant discussion is in paras 11 to 14, which are extracted as under:-

“11. In our opinion, the High Court could not have placed an outright reliance on Swaran Singh case [Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044] , without considering the nature of transaction relied upon in the said decision. The decision could not have been applied ipso facto to the facts of the instant case. In such cases, where such judgments/awards are relied on as evidence, though they are relevant, but cannot be said to be binding with respect to the determination of the price, that has to depend on the evidence adduced in the case. However, in the instant case, it appears that the land in Swaran Singh case [Swaran Singh v. State of Haryana, 2012 SCC OnLine P&H 19044] was situated just across the road as observed by the High Court as such it is relevant evidence but not binding. As such it could have been taken into consideration due to the nearness of the area, but at the same time what

was the nature of the transaction relied upon in the said case was also required to be looked into in an objective manner. Such decisions in other cases cannot be adopted without examining the basis for determining compensation whether sale transaction referred to therein can be relied upon or not and what was the distance, size and also bona fide nature of transaction before such judgments/awards are relied on for deciding the subsequent cases. It is not open to accepting determination in a mechanical manner without considering the merit. Such determination cannot be said to be binding.

12. We have come across several decisions where the High Court is adopting the previous decisions as binding. The determination of compensation in each case depends upon the nature of land and what is the evidence adduced in each case, may be that better evidence has been adduced in later case regarding the actual value of property and subsequent sale deeds after the award and before preliminary notification under Section 4 are also to be considered, if filed. It is not proper to ignore the evidence adduced in the case at hand. The compensation cannot be determined by blindly following the previous award/judgment. It has to be considered only a piece of evidence, not beyond that. The court has to apply the judicial mind and is supposed not to follow the previous awards without due consideration of the facts and circumstances and evidence adduced in the case in question. The current value reflected by comparable sale deeds is more reliable and binding for determination of compensation in such cases award/judgment relating to an acquisition made before 5 to 10 years cannot form the safe basis for determining compensation.

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

distance may also make the material difference in value. Land abutting highway may fetch higher value but not land situated in interior villages.

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

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

9.16 *Furthermore, while assessing the market value of the acquired land under the 1894 Act, the Court is required to apply the test of preponderance of probabilities. Thus, the Court assesses the market value on the basis of the evidence produced. If the parties fail to produce sufficient evidence or the best evidence, the*

*assessment of the court has to be on the basis of whatever evidence has been produced. In such circumstances, it may not be a true reflection of the market value prevailing at the relevant time. Hence, reliance on the previous judicial decision/ determination may not be a safe method to calculate the market value particularly in a case where the direct evidence like sale exemplars of the relevant period have been produced. In such an eventuality, the court should prefer to assess the market value on the basis of the sale exemplars. Undoubtedly, under Article 142 of The Constitution of India, the law declared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is binding on all the courts, however, assessment of market value of the acquired land in a particular case in the absence of any declaration of law made on a particular point, is only a decision given on the facts of that particular case and such a decision merely on the question of fact is not binding. What is binding is the ratio of the decision and not any finding on facts, or the opinion of the court on any question which was only incidental in nature or was not required to be decided in a particular case. While assessing the market value of the acquire land, with highest respect, the Hon'ble Supreme Court does not as a ratio decidendi lays down a principle of law which is binding on all the courts. As correctly observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Manoj Kumar's case (supra), such decision is only a piece of evidence produced for consideration of the court. However, in the appropriate cases, in the absence of any other evidence, the Presiding Judge may not be left with any choice but to rely upon the same in the absence of any other reliable or relevant evidence. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Krishena Kumar vs. Union of India and others (1990) 4 SCC 207**, while expounding on the phrase 'Ratio Decidendi' has held as under:-*

“20. In other words, the enunciation of the reason or principle upon which a question before a court has been decided is alone binding as a precedent. The ratio decidendi is the underlying principle, namely, the general reasons or the general grounds upon which the decision is based on the test or abstract from the specific peculiarities of the particular case which gives rise to the decision. The ratio decidendi has to be ascertained by an analysis of the facts of the case and the process of reasoning involving the major premise consisting of a pre-existing rule of law, either statutory or judge-made, and a minor premise consisting of the material facts of the case under immediate consideration. If it is not clear, it

is not the duty of the court to spell it out with difficulty in order to be bound by it. In the words of Halsbury (4th edn., Vol. 26, para 573)

“The concrete decision alone is binding between the parties to it but it is the abstract ratio decidendi, as ascertained on a consideration of the judgment in relation to the subject matter of the decision, which alone has the force of law and which when it is clear it is not part of a tribunal's duty to spell out with difficulty a ratio decidendi in order to bound by it, and it is always dangerous to take one or two observations out of a long judgment and treat them as if they gave the ratio decidendi of the case. If more reasons than one are given by a tribunal for its judgment, all are taken as forming the ratio decidendi.”

7.5 Therefore, in view of the above discussion, the market value assessed by the Court in the absence of direct/best evidence like comparable sale deeds, is based on projections as perceived in the normal course of events. Hence, the RC's assessment in the present case is based on estimation. It is well settled that the Court is required to look for best evidence to base its judgment. In the considered view of the Court, the sale exemplars of the acquired land or its vicinity are better evidence than the assessment made by the Court in a previous case arising from a different acquisition proceedings.

7.6 Now, in order to determine the correct market value prevalent on 31.03.2008 i.e. the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, it is considered appropriate to compile the information in respect of various sale deeds produced by the parties in a tabulated form:-

SALE DEED PRODUCED BY THE LANDOWNERS							
Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Amount (in Rs.)	Amount Per Acre (in Rs.)	Amount in per Sq. Yards (in Rs.)
1	P-1	5381	12.02.2008	2 Acre-5M	4,81,73,125/-	2,37,16,000/-	4900/-
2	P-4	9847	09.01.2007	20691 Sq. yard	11,41,18,874/-	2,66,94,473/-	5515/-

SALE DEED PRODUCED BY THE LANDOWNERS							
3	P-5	15184	31.03.2006	250 Sq. yard	2,00,000/-	38,72,000/-	800/-
4	HC-5	7385	04.11.2019	23K-17M	10,74,76,896/-	3,60,50,950/-	7,448.54/-
SALE DEED PRODUCED BY THE STATE							
1	R-5	4071	25.08.2009	4K-10M	14,06,500/-	25,00,444/-	516.62/-
2	R-6	8985	12.12.2008	1 Acre	25,00,000/-	25,00,000/-	516.53/-
3	R-7	7809	07.11.2008	7K-8M	23,12,500/-	25,00,000/-	516.53/-
4	R-8	15224	31.03.2006	3 Acre-15M	21,66,000/-	7,00,121/-	144.65/-
5	R-9	6468	26.11.2009	3 Acre-4M	1,17,00,000/-	38,67,769/-	799/-
6	R-10	11545	22.01.2008	3 Acre-3K-14M	51,93,750/-	15,00,000/-	310/-
7	R-11	11761	28.01.2008	3K-6M	6,19,000/-	15,00,606/-	310/-
8	R-12	13323	05.03.2008	2K-10M	4,69,000/-	15,00,800/-	310/-
9	R-13	11661	27.02.2009	4K	15,00,000/-	30,00,000/-	619/-
10	R-14	3382	04.07.2008	3K	5,62,500/-	15,00,000/-	310/-
11	R-15	1193	05.05.2008	15K-15M	19,68,750/-	10,00,000/-	206/-
12	R-16	2835	10.07.2009	6 Acre-2K-2M	81,00,000/-	12,93,413/-	267/-
13	R-17	13513	30.03.2007	7K-6M	27,00,000/-	29,58,904/-	611/-
14	R-18	9451	29.11.2007	3 Acre-7K-1M	1,20,00,000/-	30,91,787/-	638.8/-
15	R-18	4516	09.09.2009	4K-16M	9,00,000/-	15,00,000/-	309.92/-
16	R-19	1636	02.06.2009	2 Acre-4K	37,50,000/-	15,00,000/-	309.92/-

Note:- There were certain discrepancies in the table compiled by RC. Thus, for the sake of brevity a modified table is reproduced above.

7.7 If we carefully look at the layout plan Ex.HC-1 along with the layout plan Ex.P-3, it is evident that undoubtedly the acquired land is located in a municipal area, however, it is on the extreme northern side of the town. In fact, on a careful study of Ex.P-3, it is evident that the old as well as the new Hisar Town is developed in and around the main Hisar Railway Station.

7.8 The sale deed No.5381 is with respect to a different city i.e. Hansi, hence, it is not appropriate to rely upon it in the absence of evidence to prove its comparative location viz-a-viz the acquired land. It may further be noted that in the year 2019, the State of Haryana purchased the land from Sh. Sant Singh at a higher price. The new Act i.e. The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 2013 Act'), had come into force on 01.01.2014. The acquisition of the land under the 2013 Act not only results in delay but the statutory benefits namely the solatium etc. have also been substantially increased when compared with the 1894 Act. The

Court is required to examine the aforesaid sale deed in the context of the facts of the case. After issuing notification under Section 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act, the State of Haryana did not opt to acquire the parcel of land belonging to Sh. Sant Singh son of Sh. Chanchal Singh. The Vivek Cooperative House Building Society Ltd. filed CWP-9718-2009, challenging acquisition on the ground of discrimination as the land belonging to Sh. Sant Singh son of Sh. Chanchal Singh, though included in the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, was not included while announcing the award. The writ petition was allowed on 16.09.2016. The High Court, while quashing the order excluding the land of Sh. Sant Singh, directed the State to announce the award within a period of six months. However, the State of Haryana did not pronounce the award though mandated by the Division Bench of the High Court. Ultimately, Sh. Sant Singh filed a petition for initiation of contempt proceedings against the State of Haryana. During its pendency, substantial period elapsed. The State of Haryana neither announced the award nor initiated fresh proceedings for acquisition of the land. During the pendency of the Contempt Petition, an offer was made to purchase the land of Sh. Sant Singh at the rate of Rs.2795/- per square yard, which was accepted by Sh. Sant Singh resulting in execution of the sale deed No.7385, dated 04.11.2019. The aforesaid parcel of land has been purchased by the State of Haryana in a different set of circumstances. First of all, the aforesaid sale deed was executed after the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, had come into force. Secondly, the sale deed is eleven years after the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued. Thirdly, the aforesaid parcel of land

has been purchased under the threat of proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Hence, such sale deed cannot be stated to be between a willing seller and willing purchaser with respect to the market value of the acquired land. Hence, the sale deed No.7385, produced in additional evidence as Ex.HC-5 cannot be relied upon for the purpose of assessing the market value of the acquired land particularly when various sale deeds of comparable parcels of land during the contemporaneous period have been produced by the State of Haryana.

7.9 The landowners have also relied upon sale deed No.9847 (Ex.P-4) dated 09.01.2007 reflecting average per acre price at the rate of Rs.2,66,94,473/-. On a careful perusal of layout plan produced by the State of Haryana, it is evident that the aforesaid parcel of land is located at a sufficient distance from the acquired land in entirely different direction of the city. There is no evidence to prove that the aforesaid parcel of land sold through sale deed No.9847 (Ex.P-4) was comparable with the acquired land. In fact, the aforesaid sale deed is located in the same direction where showrooms have been opened by various automobile companies. Thus, there is evidence that the aforesaid parcel of land represented by sale deed No.9847 (Ex.P-4), was in the commercial area, whereas, the acquired land by notification dated 31.03.2008, was not being used for commercial purpose.

7.10 The RC has also committed error in ignoring the sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana on the ground that these are outside the municipal limit. On a careful perusal of the layout plan Ex.HC1, it is evident that the aforesaid parcels of land are located in the close vicinity of the

acquired land. As already noticed, the acquired land is on the northern corner of the city, whereas, the sale exemplars are immediately abutting the municipal limits. In the municipal area, the prices are likely to be higher, however, these cannot be assumed to be more than 3 times from the equivalent parcel of land located in close vicinity just outside municipal limits. Moreover, there is another sale deed of parcel of land on Delhi-Hisar-Sirsa Bypass. The parcel of land located on the road is likely to have fetch more than when compared with the parcel of land located at a distance from the main road. The aforesaid parcel of land is not more than 15 acres from the acquired land.

7.11 Apart from the sale deeds, the landowners have also relied upon the various awards passed by the Courts while assessing the market value of the land located in Hisar. This Court has already discussed the relevancy of the judgment passed by the Court for developing Sector 1 and 4 of Hisar vide notification dated 19.05.2003. Ex.P-18 is another award passed by the RC on 12.05.2006, with respect to acquisition of the land by notification dated 19.05.2003, with respect to Sector 1 and 4. The Court assessed the market value of the *Nehri, Chahi* and *Tal Tibba* agricultural land at the rate of Rs.10,00,000/- per acre, whereas, *gair mumkin banjar kadim* land was assessed at the rate of Rs.15,00,000/- per acre. Similarly, there is another award passed by the RC on 31.05.2013, which was, also, acquired vide notification dated 19.05.2003, wherein, the market value of the acquired land has been assessed at the rate of Rs.710/- per square yard. The land measuring 55.35 acres was acquired for Sector 1 and 4, Hisar. Ex.P-19/P26 is a judgment passed by the High Court assessing the market value of the

acquired land as on 19.04.2003, at the rate of Rs.1100.19/- per square yard for Sector 1, 3 and 4, Hisar. Similarly, Ex.P-24 is an award passed by the LAC while acquiring the land for Sector 3 and 5, Hisar. In this case, notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued on 13.11.2002, and the LAC has offered a uniform market value, for *Nehri, Chahi, gair mumkin banjar land*, at the rate of Rs.6,00,000/- per acre, whereas, the parcel of land under *tal tibba* has been assessed at the rate of Rs.5,00,000/- per acre. In this acquisition, the RC vide award dated 19.08.2010, assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.670/- per square yard. Subsequently, the High Court increased it to Rs.725.75/- per square yard, which was further increased by the Supreme Court vide judgment dated 22.08.2014 (Ex.P-25). There is another award Ex.P-27, passed by the RC on 30.05.2011 while assessing the market value of the land acquired vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act on 10.01.2002, for the purpose of connecting the existing town of Hisar through Urban Estate-II, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar, Sector 3 and 5 and Sector 1 and 4 to Raipur Road, Hisar. Subsequently, the High Court assessed the market value of the land acquired under the aforesaid notification at the rate of Rs.965/- per square yard. As already noticed, these judgments passed by the Courts, assessing the market value of the land acquired through separate notifications for different purposes located at distinct places, does not help the landowners because the comparable sale deeds of contemporaneous period have been produced in evidence, which are the best and direct evidence of the true market value prevailing at the date of notification in the present case. It is only in the absence of direct evidence i.e. in the absence of such comparable sale deeds, that the Court can resort to

the other evidence i.e. the previous assessments. In the present case, the RC has erred in disregarding the most relevant evidence directly reflecting the prevalent market value on the date of notification while relying on mere assumptions and estimations.

8. DECISION

8.1 Consequently, the judgment passed by the RC is set aside, whereas, the award passed by the LAC is maintained.

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

21st September, 2022
Ay

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party name
1.	RFA-1895-2016	RATTAN LAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
2.	RFA-1091-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S RAJINDER KUMAR AND ANOTHER
3.	RFA-1092-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S SMT. AVINASH KAUR THR. HER P.O.A.AND ANOTHER
4.	RFA-1089-2022	STATE OF HARYANA V/S NIRANJAN LAL AND ANOTHER
5.	RFA-1090-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S HANUMAN SINGH AND OTHERS
6.	RFA-1093-2022	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S SMT NIRMALA RANI AND ANOTHER
7.	RFA-2948-2016	KIRORI MAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
8.	RFA-2846-2016	KULDEEP SINGH V/S

		STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
9.	RFA-2702-2016	SAJJAN KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
10.	RFA-2614-2016	BUDH RAM & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
11.	RFA-3758-2016	SANT SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-2696-2016	SUBE SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
13.	RFA-4387-2016	DILAWAR SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
14.	RFA-1898-2016	NARESH KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
15.	RFA-1899-2016	RAMESH KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
16.	RFA-1897-2016	VIJAY KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
17.	RFA-1896-2016	RAMESH KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
18.	RFA-1893-2016	SMT. LAXMI DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
19.	RFA-1894-2016	SURESH KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
20.	RFA-263-2018	SHRI BALRAJ SAPRA & ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
21.	RFA-4904-2017	DATA RAM (DECEASED) THR. LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
22.	RFA-2829-2016	LAXMI DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
23.	RFA-2120-2016	BHAGWANA AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
24.	RFA-2692-2016	SMT. VIDYA WATI AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
25.	RFA-2606-2016	DR. TARUN SAPRA AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-2705-2016	RAGHUBIR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

27.	RFA-2947-2016	MAHENDER KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
28.	RFA-2843-2016	MIKI SHAH THR. HIS BROTHER G.P.A. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
29.	RFA-2845-2016	RAM KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
30.	RFA-2830-2016	OM PARKASH (DECEASED) THR. LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
31.	RFA-2119-2016	M/S SUPER SEEDS PVT LIMITED THR. ITS DIRECTOR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
32.	RFA-2117-2016	RAM KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
33.	RFA-2701-2016	KRISHAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
34.	RFA-2825-2016	NAND RAM AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
35.	RFA-2840-2016	SOHAN LAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
36.	RFA-3040-2016	DIN DAYAL AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
37.	RFA-2946-2016	RAM BILAS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
38.	RFA-2703-2016	RAM NIWAS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
39.	RFA-2881-2016	BALWANT AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
40.	RFA-2121-2016	NARESH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
41.	RFA-2870-2016	BHAGMAL DECEASED TH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
42.	RFA-2844-2016	NUNI RAM (DECEASED) THR. LRS AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
43.	RFA-2122-2016	NAND RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

44.	RFA-2124-2016	ARUN JAIN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
45.	RFA-2693-2016	BASANTI DEVI AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
46.	RFA-2615-2016	BISHMBER DAYAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
47.	RFA-2616-2016	SURESH KUMAR & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
48.	RFA-2651-2016	SMT. KANTA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
49.	RFA-2695-2016	TARA CHAND AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
50.	RFA-2125-2016	MOHAN LAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
51.	RFA-3525-2016	VIRENDER TANEJA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
52.	RFA-2841-2016	MANJU V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
53.	RFA-2847-2016	INDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
54.	RFA-2849-2016	HAWA SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
55.	RFA-2880-2016	SMT. CHANDRO AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
56.	RFA-2824-2016	RANDHIR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
57.	RFA-2827-2016	OM PARKASH (DECEASED) THR. LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
58.	RFA-2003-2016	SINGHA RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
59.	RFA-2689-2016	NIHAL SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
60.	RFA-3757-2016	SATISH KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
61.	RFA-3756-2016	TARANJEET SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
62.	RFA-2123-2016	BANWARI V/S

		STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
63.	RFA-2607-2016	DR. VIKAS SAPRA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
64.	RFA-2698-2016	RAM CHANDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ANR
65.	RFA-2826-2016	MUNSHI RAM AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
66.	RFA-2694-2016	SADHU RAM (DECEASED) THR. LR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
67.	RFA-2697-2016	RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
68.	RFA-3293-2016	CHOTI DEVI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
69.	RFA-2842-2016	SMT. KRISHANA DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
70.	RFA-2828-2016	PARVEEN KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
71.	RFA-2118-2016	BHALE RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
72.	RFA-2318-2016	LALIT KUMAR & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
73.	RFA-2181-2016	ANUP KUMAR & ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
74.	RFA-3755-2016	SANT SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
75.	RFA-2690-2016	SUBE SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
76.	RFA-2691-2016	RAJINDER PARSHAD AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
77.	RFA-2848-2016	BHARAT SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
78.	RFA-2699-2016	GANGA DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTEHRS
79.	RFA-2700-2016	HARI CHAND DECEASED THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
80.	RFA-2704-2016	LILU RAM AND OTHERS V/S

		STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
81.	RFA-3039-2016	SAJJAN KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
82.	RFA-1132-2021	SNEH LATA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
83.	XOBJR-107-2022	SNEH LATA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
84.	XOBJR-106-2022	NIHAL SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
85.	XOBJR-91-2022	TARANJEET SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
86.	XOBJR-142-2022	DR. TARUN SAPRA AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
87.	XOBJR-123-2022	NARESH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
88.	XOBJR-141-2022	MOHAL LAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
89.	XOBJR-140-2022	BHARAT SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
90.	XOBJR-89-2022	SMT. VIDYA WATI AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
91.	XOBJR-119-2022	BANWARI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
92.	XOBJR-118-2022	SADHU RAM (DECEASED THR. LR AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
93.	XOBJR-135-2022	DATA RAM (DECEASED THR. LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
94.	XOBJR-136-2022	CHOTI DEVI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
95.	XOBJR-157-2022	RANBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
96.	XOBJR-137-2022	SANT SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
97.	XOBJR-152-2022	OM PARKASH (DECEASED THR. LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
98.	XOBJR-130-2022	BALWANT AND OTHERS V/S

		STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
99.	XOBJR-131-2022	RAM CHANDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
100.	XOBJR-149-2022	SOHAN LAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
101.	XOBJR-92-2022	MIKI SHAHTHR. HIS BROTHER G.P.A. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
102.	XOBJR-102-2022	KULDEEP SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
103.	XOBJR-101-2022	RATTAN LAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
104.	XOBJR-111-2022	SAJJAN KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
105.	XOBJR-114-2022	BHAGMAL (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
106.	XOBJR-115-2022	MAHENDER KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
107.	XOBJR-94-2022	INDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
108.	XOBJR-93-2022	DIN DAYAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
109.	XOBJR-133-2022	LILU RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
110.	XOBJR-116-2022	SUBE SINGH AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
111.	XOBJR-95-2022	BHALE RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
112.	XOBJR-121-2022	SAJJAN KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
113.	XOBJR-129-2022	MUNSHI RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
114.	XOBJR-134-2022	PARVEEN KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
115.	XOBJR-128-2022	BISHMBER DAYAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
116.	XOBJR-126-2022	RAJENDER PARSHAD AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

117.	XOBJR-125-2022	RAGHUBIR AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
118.	XOBJR-139-2022	HAWA SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
119.	XOBJR-113-2022	ANUP KUMAR AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
120.	XOBJR-138-2022	SINGHA RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
121.	XOBJR-103-2022	SURESH KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
122.	XOBJR-105-2022	OM PARKASH (DECEASED THR. LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
123.	XOBJR-104-2022	KRISHAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
124.	XOBJR-117-2022	BASANTI DEVI AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
125.	XOBJR-156-2022	SMT LAXMI DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
126.	XOBJR-158-2022	HARI CHAND DECEASED TH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
127.	XOBJR-148-2022	RAM KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
128.	XOBJR-146-2022	SMT CHANDRO AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
129.	XOBJR-147-2022	M/S SUPER SEEDS PVT LTD THR. ITS DIRECTOR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
130.	XOBJR-145-2022	RAM KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
131.	XOBJR-108-2022	SANT SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
132.	XOBJR-151-2022	VIJAY KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
133.	XOBJR-122-2022	VIKAS SAPRA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
134.	XOBJR-85-2022	RANDHIR SINGH V/S

		STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
135.	XOBJR-120-2022	RAM BILAS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
136.	XOBJR-82-2022	MANJU V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
137.	XOBJR-132-2022	LALIT KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
138.	XOBJR-84-2022	SATISH KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
139.	XOBJR-112-2022	NAND RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
140.	XOBJR-83-2022	SMT. KANTA AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
141.	XOBJR-155-2022	SHRI BALRAJ SAPRA AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
142.	XOBJR-154-2022	SUBE SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
143.	XOBJR-88-2022	LAXMI DEVI AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
144.	XOBJR-96-2022	ARUN JAIN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
145.	XOBJR-98-2022	BHAGWANA AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
146.	XOBJR-97-2022	SMT KRISHNA DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
147.	XOBJR-100-2022	TARA CHAND AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
148.	XOBJR-99-2022	BUDH RAM AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
149.	XOBJR-124-2022	KIRORI MAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
150.	XOBJR-144-2022	NARESH KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
151.	XOBJR-143-2022	DILAWAR SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
152.	XOBJR-86-2022	NAND RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

153.	XOBJR-87-2022	RAM NIWAS AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
154.	XOBJR-127-2022	RAMESH KUMAR AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
155.	XOBJR-150-2022	GANGA DEVI AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
156.	XOBJR-109-2022	NUNI RAM (DECEASED THR. LRS AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
157.	XOBJR-110-2022	SURESH KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
158.	XOBJR-153-2022	RAMESH KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE