IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RFA-2116-2016 (O&M)
Reserved on: 24.05.2022
Date of decision: 01.06.2022

RAMPAL AND ANR ..Appellants

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS ..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANILKSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Aashish Chopra, Sr. Advocate
with Ms. Sugandha Kundu, Advocate
Ms. Gurpreet Randhawa, Advocate.

Mr. Sudhir Aggarwal, Advocate
Mr. Ajay Ghangas, Advocate
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate
Mr. Tarun Yadav, Advocate
Mr. Gaurav Aggarwal, Advocate
Mr. Sanjay Vij, Advocate
Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate
Mr. Atul Yadav, Advocate
Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate
Mr. D.K. Singal, Advocate
Mr. Kapil Kumar, Advocate
for Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the landowners.

Mr. Arun Gosain, Advocate
Mr. Sudhir Nar, Advocate
Mr. Shivoy Dhir, Advocate
Mr. Sunil Kumar Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate
for Union of India.

Ms. Vibha Tewari, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

1. **BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Two batches of appeals (details whereof are on the foot of the judgment), filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act'), with a prayer to modify the awards passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the RC') on 15.01.2016 as well as 15.03.2016, arising from common notifications under Section 4, 6 of the 1894 Act, shall stand disposed of. The acquisition has been made for establishing National Defence University in villages Binola and Bilaspur (contiguous villages) in Teshil Manesar, District Gurugram.

1.2 The learned counsel representing the parties are not only common but also *ad idem* that these appeals can conveniently be disposed of by a common judgment.

1.3 The relevant particulars of the case are as under:-

Sr. No.	Title	Details
1.	Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued proposing to acquire land for National Defence University.	21.01.2011
2.	Declaration under Section 6 of the 1894 Act was published.	12.01.2012
3.	Vide Awards No.13 and 14, The Land Acquisition Collector assessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.52,00,000/- per acre while observing that 25% extra per acre shall be payable for the land abutting National Highway No.8 upto the depth of 2 acre of village Binola which comes to Rs.65,00,000/- per acre shall be paid.	08.09.2012
4.	Extent of land acquired	In Village Binola:- 162 acres, 2 kanals and 4 marlas, In village Bilaspur:- 42 acres 6 kanals and 11 marlas.
5.	While deciding 18 reference petitions, the RC assessed the	15.01.2016

	market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.73,64,787/- with respect to village Bilaspur.	
6.	With respect to the acquired land in village Binola, the RC relying upon the judgment dated 15.01.2016, assessed the same market value i.e. Rs.73,64,787/-.	15.03.2016

1.4 The landowners claim that the acquired land is not less than Rs.10 Crore per acre. It is claimed that the acquired land is located near the factory of Hero Honda and Ansal Industrial Park. Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway is hardly 5 kms away from the acquired land. There are four engineering colleges in the nearby area. On the other hand, Union of India claim that the assessment has been correctly made by a Committee consisting of senior officers and the market value of the acquired land is not more than what has been awarded.

2. ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE PRODUCED IN VILLAGE BINOLA

2.1 ORAL EVIDENCE:-

2.1.1 In the cases arising from village Binola, the landowners have examined the following witnesses:-

1.	*PW-1*	*Sh. Babu Lal, Patwari*
2.	*PW-2*	*Sh. Subhash Chand, Patwari,*
3.	*PW-3*	*Sh. Ajay Kumar, Registration Clerk*
4.	*PW-4*	*Sh. Rameshwar*
5.	*PW-5*	*Sh. Bishan Kumar, Clerk from Excise and Taxation Department*
6.	*PW-7*	*Sh. Amit Bhandari, Director of*

		M/s Auto Mac Pvt. Ltd.
7.	*PW-8*	*Sh. Inder, Patwari*
8.	*PW-9*	*Sh. Lalit Kumar, Photographer*
9.	*PW-10*	*Sh. Ashok Kumar, one of the landowner*

2.1.2 On the other hand, the respondents examined the following witnesses:-

RW-1	*Sh. Rattan Singh, SDO-II, Defence State Officer, Delhi Circle, Delhi Cantt.*

2.2 **DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE:**

2.2.1 The landowners in order to prove their case, produced the following evidence apart from the sale deeds, table of which is compiled in para 3.2.2 of the judgment:-

Sr. No.	***Exhibit***	***Particular***
1.	*Ex.P-1*	*Revenue layout plan of village Binola*
2.	*Ex.P-2*	*Revenue layout plant of village Bilaspur*
3.	*Ex.PW5/A*	*Form VAT-GI*
4.	*Ex.PW6/1*	*Report of architect, engineer and valuer*
5.	*Ex.P6/2*	*Plan of existing building*
6.	*Ex.P8*	*Final development plan for control areas of Gurgaon-Manesar Urban Complex, 2021*
7.	*Ex.P9*	*Final development plan for control areas of Gurgaon-Manesar Urban Complex, 2025*
8.	*Ex.P-10*	*Final development plan for control areas of Gurgaon-Manesar Urban Complex, 2031 AD*
9.	*Ex.P9*	*Final development plan for control areas of Pataudi and*

		Haily Mandi, 2031
10.	*Ex.PW8/A*	*Statement prepared by LAC*
11.	*Ex.PW8/B*	*Statement prepared by LAC*
12.	*Ex.PW9/1 to Ex.PW9/34*	*Photographs*
13.	*Ex.P10/B and Ex.P10/C*	*Part of the revenue layout plan*
14.	*Ex.P12*	*Information received under Right to Information Act, 2005*

2.2.2 On the other hand, the Union of India has produced Ex.R-2 (proceedings of the meeting of Divisional level Committee held on 02.02.2012) and Ex.R-3 (the award passed by the RC on 15.01.2016, while deciding the cases of village Bilaspur acquired by same notification).

3. **ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE PRODUCED IN VILLAGE BILASPUR**

3.1 **ORAL EVIDENCE:**

3.1.1 In the cases arising from village Bilaspur, the landowners examined the following witnesses:-

Sr. No.	***Exhibit***	***Particular***
1.	*Ex.PW-1*	*Sh. Bhupender Singh, Registration Clerk*
2.	*Ex.PW-2*	*Sh. Babu Lal, Patwari*
3.	*Ex.PW-3*	*Sh. Adarsh Kumar, one of the landowner.*

3.1.2 Whereas, on the other hand, respondents examined Sh. Rattan Singh, SDO-II, Office of Defence State Officer, Delhi Circle, Delhi Cantt.

3.2 **DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE:**

3.2.1 The landowners in order to prove their case, produced the following evidence apart from the sale deeds, table of which is compiled in para 3.2.2 of the judgment:-

Ex.P-5 (revenue layout plan).

On the other hand, the Union of India has produced the revenue layout plan and the sale deeds details whereof are given in the separate table, produced in para 3.2.2 of the judgment.

3.2.2 VILLAGE BILASPUR

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Land Calculated in Marlas	Price consideration	Price Per Acre	Village
1.	P-3	1981	07.01.2011	5A-3K-9M	869	80000000	14729574	Bilaspur
2.	P-4	1276	05.08.2011	4A-2K-0.39M	680.39	59000000	13874395	Bilaspur
3.	R-3	412	09.06.2010	6K	120	3000000	4000000	Bilaspur
4.	R-4	440	14.06.2010	1A-5K-10M	270	6750000	4000000	Bilaspur
5.	R-5	476	17.06.2010	3A-3K-7M	547	13675000	4000000	Bilaspur
6.	R-6	525	25.06.2010	6K-10M	130	3643000	4483692	Bilaspur
7.	R-7	1148	06.10.2010	1A-1K-12.5M	192.5	4894450	4068114	Bilaspur
8.	R-8	1442	16.11.2010	1A-5K-10M	270	7087500	4200000	Bilaspur
9.	R-9	1443	16.11.2010	1A-5K-10M	270	7087500	4200000	Bilaspur
10.	R-10	1524	24.11.2010	6K-15M	135	4218750	5000000	Bilaspur
11.	R-11	1575	30.11.2010	1A-4K-1M	241	7500000	4979253	Bilaspur
12.	R-12	1599	02.12.2010	1A-6K-12M	292	7665000	4200000	Bilaspur
13.	R-13	1630	06.12.2010	2A-2K-7M	367	9633750	4200000	Bilaspur
14.	R-14	1641	06.12.2010	4K-10M	90	3000000	5333333	Bilaspur
15.	R-15	1740	15.12.2010	2A-3K-9M	389	12156250	5000000	Bilaspur
16.	R-16	2795	01.03.2011	4K-19M	99	2600000	4202020	Bilaspur
17.	R-17	2796	01.03.2011	5K	100	2625000	4200000	Bilaspur
18.	R-18	2799	01.03.2011	1A-3K-0.3M	220.3	6181250	4489332	Bilaspur
19.	R-19	2800	01.03.2011	7K-6.8M	146.8	4131250	4502724	Bilaspur
20.	R-20	2802	01.03.2011	6K-14.2M	134.2	3774500	4500149	Bilaspur

VILLAGE BINOLA

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No.	Date	Area	Land Calculated in Marlas	Price consideration	Price Per Acre	Village
1.	P-1 P-6 P-7	9683	03.08.2007	8A-7K-2M	1422	190000000	21378340	Binola
2.	P-2	3145	31.03.2011	15A-6K-12M	2532	89000000	5624012	Binola
3.	P-3	669	26.07.2010	210 Sq.Yards	-	8,00,000	1,84,38,095	Binola
4.	P-4	1277	21.10.2010	30 Sq.Yards	-	70,000	1,12,93,333	Binola
5.	P-5	1420	12.11.2010	7 M	7	5,00,000	1,14,28,571	Binola
6.	P-6	2590	10.02.2011	272 Sq.Yards	-	6,26,500	1,11,48,014	Binola
7.	R-4	677	27.07.2010	2A-6K-13M	453	1,13,25,000	40,00,000	Binola
8.	R-5	908	03.09.2010	2A	320	80,00,000	40,00,000	Binola
9.	R-6	395	04.06.2010	1A-1K-10M	190	53,00,000	44,63,157	Binola
10.	R-7	709	30.07.2010	1A-2K-7M	207	51,75,000	40,00,000	Binola
11.	R-8	681	27.07.2010	1A-6K-13M	293	73,25,000	40,00,000	Binola
12.	R-9	678	27.07.2010	2A-6K-13M	453	1,13,25,000	40,00,000	Binola
13.	R-10	680	27.07.2010	9A	1440	3,60,00,000	40,00,000	Binola
14.	R-11	679	27.07.2010	9A	1440	3,60,00,000	40,00,000	Binola

4. **REASONS AND ANALYSIS OF THE AWARD MADE BY THE REFERENCE COURT IN BOTH THE VILLAGES:**

4.1 While firstly deciding the cases arising from village Bilaspur, the RC has recorded the following reasons:-

1. There is no reason to award separate amount for the acquired land abutting National Highway.

2. The sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana cannot be taken into consideration being of lesser price *than the amount awarded by the LAC in view of Section 25 of the 1894 Act.*

3. Sale Deed No.1641 dated 06.12.2010 (Ex.R-14), but the difference between the area sold and the acquisition is very huge.

4. Sale Deed No.1981 dated 07.01.2011 (Ex.P-3), with respect to the 43 kanals and 9 marlas land sold at the rate of Rs.1,47,29,574/- is comparable.

5. The RC after applying deduction of the 50% towards difference in the area of the acquired land and the exemplar sale deed assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.73,64,787/- per acre.

6. There is no evidence of damages suffered by the landowners on account of severance of the unacquired or remaining land.

4.2 While deciding the cases of village Binola, apart from the reasons recorded by the RC while deciding the cases of village Bilaspur, the RC has held that all the exemplar sale deeds produced by both the parties are not comparable. Thereafter, the RC relied upon its previous award dated 15.01.2016 to assess the same market value, as decided in that award.

4.3 The RC has not recorded any reason whatsoever while observing that there is no such reason for the separate assessment of the market value of the land abutting National Highway No.8 i.e. Delhi-Jaipur Highway. Without any evidence, the RC has observed the same. The RC has also not given any reason before returning the aforesaid findings. Similarly, the RC has committed an error in wrongly interpreting Section 25 of the 1894 Act, which is extracted as under:-

> *"25. Amount of compensation awarded by Court not to be lower than the amount awarded by the Collector. - The amount of compensation awarded by the Court shall not be less than the amount awarded by the Collector under section 11.*"

4.3 It has evident from the careful reading of the provision that Section 25 of the 1894 Act, only debars the Court from awarding the market value less than the amount assessed by the LAC. There is no prohibition for the Court to take into consideration, the sale deeds produced by the parties which reflect a price lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. This matter is no longer *res integra* in view of the judgment passed in ***Lal Chand Vs. Union of India, 2009(15) SCC 769***. The RC has also erred in discarding the sale exemplar Ex.R-14 i.e. Sale Deed No. 1641, dated 06.12.2010, through which 4 kanals and 10 marlas land was sold at the rate of Rs.40,00,000/- per acre. It may be noted here that the RC without applying its mind has stated that the gap between the area of land sold through the sale deed and the area of acquired land is huge. Similarly, the RC has erred in relying upon the sale exemplar vide Sale Deed No.1981, dated 07.01.2011, with respect to the sale of 43 kanals and 9 marlas, land located in village Binola, sold for a total sale consideration of Rs.8 Crores, at the rate of Rs.1,47,29,574/- per acre. The RC has overlooked that this parcel of land is located on the other side/across the National Highway No.8. The Court has also erred in overlooking that the various sale instances of the various parcels of the land located on the National Highway, which are not only located on the same side of the National Highway alongwith the acquired land but also located near the acquired land.

5. ARGUMENTS MADE BY THE LEARNED COUNSEL REPRESENTING THE PARTIES:

5.1 This Bench has heard the learned counsel representing the parties and with their able assistance perused the paperbook of both the lead cases in two different batches as well as the record which was requisitioned.

5.2 The learned counsel representing the appellant contends that the land is situated near the Industrial Area, Manesar, and is abutting National Highway No.8 (Delhi-Jaipur Highway). They further contend that the RC has committed an error while applying 50% deduction on account of dissimilarity in the parcel of land sold in the sale deed exemplars and the acquired land. They contend that the Sale Deed No.1981 is with respect to more than 5 acres of land, which is sufficiently a big parcel of land and, consequently, 50% deduction was not correct. Per contra, Union of India also filed appeals claiming that the assessment made by the RC is excessive.

6. DISCUSSION BY THIS COURT:

6.1 Before proceeding further, it is important to take note of the location of the acquired land. Some part of the acquired land located in village Binola is abutting the National Highway No.8 (Delhi-Jaipur Highway). It has been noticed from the careful perusal of the layout plan produced by the respective parties, that approximately 5 acres of the acquired land is located on the National Highway. It may further be significant to note that the acquired land of village Bilaspur is not located on the National Highway. In fact, the acquired land of village Bilaspur is located behind the acquired land of village Binola. The landowners have tried to project that Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway is 5kms away from the acquired land. It may be noted here that at that time Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway which is also known as Western Peripheral Expressway was not developed although idea of its development was in the pipeline. Hence, the reliance placed on the aforesaid fact by the landowners is wrong.

6.2 Moreover, it is significant to note that the acquired land in village Binola consists of land comprised in Rectangle No.25, 26, 32, 33, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 49 and 50. Whereas, the acquired land of village Bilaspur is located in Rectangle No.4, 9, 10, 11 and 20. At this stage, it is important to explain the expression "rectangle" in the context of the size of the land.

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

6.4 On the careful examination of the revenue layout plan of village

Binola, it is evident that the State has produced a Sale Deed exemplar No.709, dated 30.07.2010, evidencing sale of land, measuring 10 kanals 7 marlas, at the rate of Rs.51,75,000/-. This is approximately five months prior to the date of notification under Section 4. This parcel of the land comprises of Rectangle No.26, Khasra Nos.3 and 4. This land is not only located on the National Highway No.8 (Delhi-Jaipur Highway) but is located hardly 3 acres away from the acquired land on the same side of National Highway as the acquired land. The land comprised in Rectangle No.26, Khasra No.4/1/2, is at a distance of 3 acres from the land comprised in Rectangle No.26, Khasra Nos.23 and 24. In other words, a part of the acquired land as well as the land sold vide Sale Deed No.709, are from the land comprised in same rectangle i.e. 26.

6.5 Furthermore, the Union of India has produced sale exemplars showing purchase of land comprised in Rectangle No.14, 15, 16, 17 through the various sale exemplars. This parcel of land is also located on the same side of the National Highway as is the acquired land and is at distance of 6-7 acres from the acquired land.

6.6 This Bench now proceeds to examine the Sale Deed No.1981, dated 07.01.2011, relied upon by the Court which is Ex.P-3. This parcel of land is located on the other side of the National Highway. A major chunk of the aforesaid land is located on the National Highway itself. Furthermore, the Sale Deed No.1981, has been sold by the Premium Automobiles Pvt. Ltd. through Sh. Pawan Sachdeva. Smt. Sangeeta Sachdeva, wife of Sh. Pawan Sachdeva, has sold another parcel of land measuring 33 kanal 19 marlas 6 sarsai vide Sale Deed No.1726, on 05.08.2011, at a much lesser rate. This parcel of land is located behind the land sold by the Premium Automobile Industries. The purchaser in both the sale deeds is Mitsuba Sical India Ltd.

6.7 Once, the sale exemplar of the land located in the same rectangle is available, the RC committed an error in relying upon the sale exemplar with regard to the parcel of the land which is located across the National Highway. The RC has also overlooked that the sale deed Ex.P-3 is just 15 days before the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. When two corporate entities had entered into a contract of sale and, consequently, the parcel of land is not likely to have been purchased for the purpose of agriculture.

6.8 Similarly, on a careful perusal of the layout plan of village Bilaspur, it is evident that the State of Haryana produced various sale exemplars to prove that the price of the nearby land was in the range of Rs.40 to 50 lacs per acre. It has been noticed that the acquired land of village Bilaspur is from Rectangle No.4, 9, 10, 11 and 20. whereas, the various sale exemplars of the land comprised in Rectangles No.59, 60, 61 and 62 have been produced. These parcels of land are located nearby the acquired land. The land comprised in Rectangle No.42 starts at a distance of 8 acres from the acquired land. Similarly, the land comprised in Rectangle No.43, is also at a distance of 10 acres only from the acquired land.

6.9 Hence, the RC has committed an error in placing reliance on the award with respect to village Bilaspur.

6.10 This Bench now proceeds to examine the contentions of the learned counsel representing the appellants.

6.11 The first argument of the learned counsel representing the landowners is though convincing and solid, but in absence of the sufficient corroborative evidence, the Court cannot assess the market value merely on the basis that the acquired land is not only located in Tehsil Manesar but also located on the Delhi-Jaipur Highway.

6.12 The next argument of the learned counsel representing the landowners is with respect to 50% development cut applied by the RC, which is erroneous. However, this Court has reassessed the market value of the acquired land. This Court, on appreciation of evidence, have chosen not to rely upon the aforesaid sale deed exemplar, hence, the argument remains academic.

6.13 Now, the question that arises for adjudication is that what should be the appropriate market value of the acquired land.

6.14 As already noticed, there are various sale instances produced by the Union of India to prove that the market value of the acquired land was not more than Rs.52,00,000/- per acre. The LAC while assessing the market value has held that the landowners of the land located on the belt of 2 acres, abutting the National Highway located in village Binola shall be entitled to Rs.65,00,000/- per acre. If we compare this price with the sale exemplar of the land located 3 acres from the acquired land, it is evident that the land has been sold vide Sale Deed No.709 dated 30.07.2010, at the rate of Rs.40,00,000/-.

6.15 Furthermore, as already noticed with respect to the acquired land located in village Bilaspur, the various sale deed exemplars of the land located in Rectangle Nos.42, 43 and 60, which are located nearby have been produced, are preferable to assess the market value of the acquired land.

7. **DECISION**

7.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the appeals filed by Union of India are allowed, whereas, the appeals filed by the landowners stand dismissed. While setting aside the judgment passed by the RC, the amount assessed by the LAC is found more appropriate and therefore, maintained.

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

01st June, 2022 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
Ay **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned *: Yes/No*

Whether reportable *: Yes/No*

Sr. No.	Case No.	Appellants	Respondents
1.	RFA No.2116 of 2016	Rampal and another	State of Haryana & others
2. 1	RFA No.2638 of 2016	Brahmanand (deceased) through his LRs & others	State of Haryana & others
3.	RFA No.2639 of 2016	Brahmanand (deceased) through his LRs & others	State of Haryana & others
4.	RFA No. 2878 of 2016	Satbir Singh	State of Haryana & others
5.	RFA No. 2875 of 2016	Rameshwar and others	State of Haryana & others
6.	RFA No. 2877 of 2016	Ashok Kumar and others	State of Haryana & others
7.	RFA No. 2901 of 2016	Inderjeet	State of Haryana & others
8.	RFA No. 4480 of 2017	Government of India and another	Adarsh and others
9.	RFA No. 3092 of	Smt. Tarawati	State of Haryana

	2016		& others
10.	RFA No. 3663 of 2016	Pyare Lal & others	State of Haryana & others
11.	RFA No. 3664 of 2016	Balwant and another	State of Haryana & others
12.	RFA No. 3665 of 2016	Jaipal and others	State of Haryana & others
13.	RFA No. 3666 of 2016	Karan Singh	State of Haryana & others
14.	RFA No. 3667 of 2016	Smt. Birmati and another	State of Haryana & others
15.	RFA No. 3668 of 2016	Jagdev and others	State of Haryana & others
16.	RFA No. 3669 of 2016	Sanjeet and another	State of Haryana & others
17.	RFA No. 3670 of 2016	Balwan Singh and another	State of Haryana & others
18.	RFA No. 4324 of 2016	Ishwar and others	State of Haryana & others
19.	RFA No. 572 of 2018	Raje Ram @ Raja Ram @ Jage Ram	State of Haryana & others
20.	RFA No. 4225 of 2017	Government of India and another	Rameshwar and others
21.	RFA No. 4101 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) & another	Rampal and others
22.	RFA No. 4323 of 2017	Government of India and another	Karan Singh and others
23.	RFA No. 4474 of 2017	Government of India and another	Jagdev and others
24.	RFA No. 4475 of 2017	Government of India and another	Balwan Singh and others
25.	RFA No. 4476 of 2017	Government of India and another	Balwant and others
26.	RFA No. 4477 of 2017	Government of India and another	Jaipal and others
27.	RFA No. 4478 of 2017	Government of India and another	Sanjeet and others
28.	RFA No. 4479 of 2017	Government of India and another	Smt. Birmati and others
29.	RFA No. 4658 of 2017 (O&M	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Brahmanand (deceased)

			through his LRs & others
30.	RFA No. 4730 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Raje Ram @ Raja Ram @ Jage Ram and others
31.	RFA No. 4770 of 2017	Government of India and another	Pappu and others
32.	RFA No. 4958 of 2017 (O&M	Government of India and another	Pyare Lal and others
33.	RFA No. 4375 of 2017	Government of India and another	Ashok Kumar and others
34.	RFA No. 4379 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Daya Ram and others
35.	RFA No. 4380 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Smt. Kanta Devi and others
36.	RFA No. 4381 of 2017	Government of India and another	Rameshwar and others
37.	RFA No. 4384 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Smt. Rekha and others
38.	RFA No. 5122 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Raje Ram @ Raja Ram @ Jage Ram and others
39.	RFA No. 3004 of 2016	M/s T.S. Automach Pvt. Ltd.	State of Haryana & others
40.	RFA No. 4390 of 2016	Adarsh Kumar and others	State of Haryana & others
41.	RFA No. 4957 of 2017 (O&M	Government of India and another	Ishwar and others
42.	RFA No. 4378 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Suresh Kumar Mehta and others
43.	RFA No. 4298 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Sanjay Razdan and others
44.	RFA No. 4306 of 2017	Union of India	P.K.Sharma and others
45.	RFA No. 4382 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Manoj Kumar Trehan and others
46.	XOBJR No. 84 in RFA No. 4383 of 2017	Joint Secretary and another	Manoj Kumar and others
47.	RFA No. 4383 of 2017	Joint Secretary and another	Manoj Kumar and others
48.	RFA No. 4501 of	Ministry of Defence and	M/s NCJ Estate

	2017	others	Solutions Pvt. Ltd. & others
49.	RFA No. 5123 of 2017	Government of India and another	Surajbhan and others
50.	RFA No. 4503 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Brahmanand (deceased) through his LRs and others
51.	RFA No. 3093 of 2016	Kanta Devi and others	State of Haryana & others
52.	RFA No. 3094 of 2016	Smt. Rekha and another	State of Haryana & others
53.	RFA No. 3095 of 2016	Hanuman	State of Haryana & others
54.	RFA No. 3096 of 2016	Dharmender Kumar Tayal and another	State of Haryana & others
55.	RFA No. 3733 of 2016	Pyare Lal and another	State of Haryana & others
56.	RFA No. 3734 of 2016	M/s Vibrant Resorts & Enterainment Pvt. Ltd.	State of Haryana & others
57.	RFA No. 3750 of 2016	Ratan Singh and others	State of Haryana & others
58.	RFA No. 3751 of 2016	Ratan Singh and others	State of Haryana & others
59.	RFA No. 3752 of 2016	Daya Ram and another	State of Haryana & others
60.	RFA No. 3753 of 2016	Bala Ram since deceased through his LRs and others	State of Haryana & others
61.	RFA No. 3754 of 2016	Bala Ram since deceased through his LRs and others	State of Haryana & others
62.	RFA No. 3788 of 2016	Jasbir	State of Haryana & others
63.	XOBJR No. 19-C1-2018 in RFA No. 4325 of 2017	Government of India and another	Smt.Bimla Yadav and others
64.	RFA No. 4325 of 2017	Government of India and another	Smt.Bimla Yadav and others
65.	RFA No. 4763 of 2016	M/s Passion Realtech Private Limited	State of Haryana & others
66.	RFA No. 111 of 2017	Ishwar and others	State of Haryana & others

67.	RFA No. 816 of 2017	Suresh Kumar Mehta and another	State of Haryana & others
68.	RFA No. 2511 of 2017	Pradeep Krishna Chaturvedi	State of Haryana & others
69.	RFA No. 573 of 2018	Raje Ram alias Raja Ram alias Jage Ram	State of Haryana & others
70.	RFA No. 699 of 2018	Mrs Mamta Gupta	State of Haryana & others
71.	RFA No. 1899 of 2018	Dinesh	State of Haryana & others
72.	RFA No. 4046 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Smt. Tarawati and others
73.	RFA No. 4158 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Mrs. Mamta Gupta and others
74.	RFA No. 4159 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Bala Ram (deceased) through his LRs and others
75.	RFA No. 4190 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Sh. Pradeep Krishna Chaturvedi and others
76.	XOBJR No. 16-C1-2018 in RFA No. 4191 of 2017	Government of India and another	Smt. Premwati and others
77.	RFA No. 4191 of 2017	Government of India and another	Smt. Premwati and others
78.	RFA No. 4224 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Sanjeev Kumar and others
79.	RFA No. 4294 of 2016	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Inderjeet and others
80.	RFA No. 4299 of 2017	Government of India and another	M/s Passion Real Tech Pvt. Ltd. and others
81.	RFA No. 4300 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Bala Ram (deceased) through LRs
82.	RFA No. 4301 of 2017	Government of India and another	Satbir Singh and others
83.	RFA No. 4302 of 2017	Government of India and another	M/s Vibrant Resorts and Entertainment Pvt. Ltd and

			others
84.	RFA No. 4303 of 2017	Government of India and another	Pyare Lal and others
85.	RFA No. 4304 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Rattan Singh and others
86.	RFA No. 4305 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	M/s T.S. Automach Pvt. Limited & others
87.	RFA No. 4322 of 2017	Government of India and another	Ishwar and others
88.	XOBJR No. 19-C1-2018 RFA No. 4325 of 2017	Government of India and another	Smt. Bimla Yadav and others
89.	RFA No. 4325 of 2017	Government of India and another	Smt. Bimla Yadav and others
90.	RFA No. 4326 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Dharmender Kumar Tayal and others
91.	RFA No. 4327 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Dinesh and others
92.	XOBJR No.3-C1-2018 in RFA No. 4328 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Suman Raheja and others
93.	RFA No. 4328 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Suman Raheja and others
94.	RFA No. 4329 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Hanuman and others
95.	RFA No. 4330 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Jagbir and others
96.	RFA No. 4331 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Rattan Singh & others
97.	RFA No. 4341 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Bala Ram (Since Deceased) through LRs and others
98.	RFA No. 4374 of 2017	Joint Secretary (Training) and another	Inderjeet & others
99.	RFA No. 4473 of 2017	Government of India and another	Dharmender and others
100.	RFA No. 1440 of 2017	Rameshwar & others	Anuradha & others
101.	XOBJR No.17-C1-2018 in RFA No.	Government of India and another	Sunita Saini and others

	4439 of 2017		
102.	RFA No. 4439 of 2017	Government of India and another	Sunita Saini and others

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE