IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RFA-458-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.03.2022

M/s Satkarta Realtors (P) Ltd.

....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present- Mr. Aashish Chopra, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Gurpreet Randhawa, Advocate
Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Pankaj Kaushik, Advocate
Mr. S.P. Chahar, Advocate, Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate,
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate, Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate,
Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate,
Ms. Anita Balyan, Advocate,
Mr. Viresh Dahiya, Advocate, Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate, Mr. Govind Chauhan, Advocate,
Mr. N.C. Kinra, Advocate, Mr. Harsh Kinra, Advocate,
Mr. Pardeep Singh Poonia, Advocate, Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate, Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate, Mr. S.P. Khatri, Advocate, Mr. Ashwani Bakshi, Advocate,Mr. M.S. Rana, Advocate, Mr. M.S. Khillan, Advocate, Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate, Mr.Y.P. Malik, Advocate,
Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate, Mr. S.R. Hooda, Advocate,
Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate, Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate,
Mr. Kamal Mor, Advocate, Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate
for the landowners.

Ms. Vibha Tewari, AAG, Haryana and
Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1.Introduction

This batch of 154 appeals (details whereof are given at the foot of the judgment) filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') assailing the correctness of the different awards passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'RC') on 17.09.2014, 25.08.2015, 30.11.2015 and 11.04.2016 respectively, while deciding the various reference applications filed u/s 18 of the 1894 Act, shall stand disposed of. The notifications under Section 4 and 6 are common. The acquired land which is in a compact block, is spread over 3 different revenue estates namely, Rohtak, Bhaiyapur and Para. It has been acquired for developing Sector 36-A, Rohtak. Through separate awards, the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as 'the LAC') has assessed identical market value of the acquired land. The acquired land is surrounded as under:-

East	Bye-pass road
North	Sector 37
West	Peripheral road 60 metres wide
South	Railway track

The evidence led by the parties is also more or less common. Most of the learned counsel representing the parties are not only common but are also ad idem that this batch of appeals can conveniently be disposed of by one judgment.

2. Facts:-

2.1 The relevant particulars are compiled as under:-

15.12.2006	Notification (LAC(II)-2006/NTLA/348) under Section 4 of the 1894 Act was issued proposing to acquire land measuring 8.23 acres from village Bhaiyyapur, 99.97 acres from village Para and 398.34 acres from revenue estate, Rohtak.
14.12.2007	Declaration under Section 6 of the 1894 Act was issued.
30.11.2009	By three different awards no. 35, 33 and 34 with respect to Bhaiyyapur, land measuring 8.23 acres, village Para 42.65 acres and Rohtak, 331.86 acres of land was acquired. In other words, in village Para, 57.32 acres and in Village Rohtak 64.51 acre has not been acquired. The LAC uniformly assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.20,00,000/- per acre with respect to the land situated in all the three revenue estates.
17.09.2014	The Reference Court, while deciding the cases arising from village Bhaiyyapur dismissed the application under Section 18 of the 1894 Act.
25.08.2015	With respect to the acquired land located in village revenue estate, Rohtak, the Reference Court enhanced the market value of the acquired land by dividing the same into two different parcels. The acquired land abutting the National Highway upto the depth of 1 acre was assessed at the rate of Rs.32,00,000/- per acre whereas the land beyond the depth of 1 acre from the National Highway was assessed at the rate of Rs.26,18,000/- per acre.
30.10.2015	The Reference Court again assessed the market value of the acquired land upto the depth of 1 acre on the National Highway at rate of Rs.32,00,000/- per acre, whereas, the acquired land beyond the depth of 1 acre was assessed at Rs.28,65,000/- per acre.
11.04.2016	By another award with respect to revenue estate Rohtak, the Reference Court followed the judgment passed on 25.08.2015 and assessed the market value of the land upto the depth of 1 acre from the National Highway at the rate of 32,00,000/- per acre, whereas, the acquired land beyond the depth of 1 acre was assessed at Rs.26,18,000/- per acre.

3. Oral and documentary evidence

Hence all these appeals have been heard Village wise

3.1 With respect to acquired land located in **Village Bhaiyyapur**, only 2 applications u/s 18 of the 1894 Act were decided vide award dated 17.09.2014. The landowners in order to prove their case examined Sunil Kumar, one of the petitioners as PW1. Further, the sale deeds produced by the landowners have been complied in a tabulated form in para 3.14.

3.3 On the other hand, the State examined Ram Niwas, Kanungo as RW1 and produced the following documents:-

Ex.RW1/A	Affidavit of Ram Niwas Kanungo
Ex.R-1	Copy of notification under Section 4 of the Act.
Ex.R-2	Copy of notification under Section 6 of the Act.
Ex.R-3	Copy of Collector rate
Ex.R-4	Copy of RR Policy
Ex.R-5	Copy of Award No.35 dated 30.11.2009
Ex.R-11	Aks-sijra

3.4 The RC, after noticing that the landowners have failed to produce sale deed with respect to sale of land in village Bhaiyyapur, dismissed the applications. The RC did not rely upon sale exemplars Ex.P1 to P7 with respect to various parcels of land located in villages Sukhpura, Para and Chunipura**,** Rohtak.

3.5 **With respect to acquired land located in Village Revenue Estate, Rohtak** The RC, while deciding 230 reference petitions vide **award dated 25.08.2015** has assessed the market value of the acquired land, as already noticed.

3.6 In this batch of reference petitions, the landowners examined PW1, Rajbir Singh, Clerk in the office of Sub-Registrar/Tehsildar, Rohtak, PW2 Prem Singh s/o Dharam Singh, one of the owners, PW3 Chunni Lal , PW4 Parveen, the claimants in the cases, PW5 Rajbir Singh, PW6 Ashok Kumar, Patwari. The following documents were also produced, apart from the sale deeds, a compliation of which has been produced in Para 3.14.

Ex.P5	Mutation No. 13449
Ex.P6	Mutation No. 13408
Ex.P7	Mutation No. 13385
Ex.P8	Mutation No. 13382
Ex.P9	Notification under Section 4 dated 15.12.2006
Ex.P10	Copy of Award No. 33 dated 30.11.2009
Ex.P11	Site Plan
Ex.P12	Estimate of cost
Ex.P13 to P21	Photographs
Ex.P22 to P26	Statement No.19 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894
Ex.P30	Aks-Shizra
Ex.P31	Award Statement
Ex.P32	Aks-Shizra
Ex.P33	Estimated cost
Mark A1	Copy of Aks-Shizra
Mark A2	Minutes of Meeting dated 21.7.2010
Mark A3 to A5	Letters regarding market value

3.7 On the other hand, the State of Haryana examined RW1 Ram Niwas, Kanungo, posted in the office of Land Acquisition Officer, Rohtak. The following documents were also produced, apart from the sale deeds, a compilation of which has been produced in Para 3.14.:-

Ex.R1	Notification dated 15.12.2006 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894
Ex.R2	Notification dated 14.12.2007 under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894
Ex.R3	Minutes of the Meeting of Divisional Level Committee, held under the chairmanship of the Commissioner, Rohtak.
Ex.R4	Oustees Scheme
Ex.R5	Award No.33 dated 30.11.2009
Ex.R10	Aks-Shizra

3.8 While deciding 21 reference petitions filed under Section 18 of the 1894 Act with respect to acquired land located in **village Para**, the RC re-assessed the market value, as already noticed.

3.9 Before the RC, the landowners examined PW1 Baljit Singh, Record Keeper, PW2 Manoj Kumar Patwari, PW3, Pawan Kmar, Record keeper, PW4 Inder Singh s./o Shiv Karan, PW5 Sumer Singh, Record Keeper, PW6, Suresh Kumar, Patwari, PW7 Rajesh Ohlan, PW8, Sumer Singh, Record keeper, was once again examined as PW8 whereas Uttam Kumar, Patwari was examined as PW9.

3.10 They also produced the following documents, apart from the sale deeds, a compliation of which has been produced in Para 3.14.:-

Ex.P28 to 54	Mutations
Ex.P55	Collector rate 2006-2007
Ex.P56	Licence of Town and Country Planning
Ex.P57	Aks-Shizra (Sector 36-A)
Ex.P58	Notification under Section 4 of the Act dated 15.12.2006
Ex.P59	Notification under Section 6 of the Act dated 14.12.2007
Ex.P60	Copy of Award No.34 dated 30.11.2009
Ex.P61	Aks-Shizra Sector 36 VPO Para
Ex.P66 to 69	Mutations

3.11 On the other hand, the State of Haryana examined RW1 Ram Niwas, Kanungo and produced the following documents, apart from the sale deeds, a compilation of which has been produced in Para 3.14.:-

Ex.R1	Notification under Section 4 dated 15.12.2006
Ex.R2	Notification under Section 6 dated 14.12.2007

Ex.R3	Minutes of meeting dated 29.02.2008 of the Commissioner, Rohtak
Ex.R4	Oustees Scheme
Ex.R5	Copy of Award No.35 dated 30.11.2009
Ex.R9	Aks-Shazira of Sector 36A at Rohtak
Ex.R10	Details of Sale deeds

3.12 By yet another award, **dated 11.04.2016**, the LAC decided as many as 8 applications filed under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. The landowners, in order to prove their case, examined PW1 Abhishek Singh and produced the following documents, apart from the sale deeds, a compilation of which has been produced in Para 3.14.:-

Ex.P1	Certified copy of the resolution passed in meeting of Board of Directors
Ex.P2	Aks-Shizra

3.13 On the other hand, the State examined RW1 Suresh Kumar Patwari and produced in evidence a certified copy of judgment dated 25.08.2015 passed in **Choti Devi vs. State of Haryana and another decided on 25.08.2015.**

3.14 A tabulated compilation of the sale deeds produced by the respective parties in the various villages namely Bhaiyyapur, Para, Revenue Estate Rohtak has been compiled as under:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price	Price Per Acre
Village Bhaiyyapur **(Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)**						
1.	R-9	2714	08.06.2007	357 Sq. Yards	1,43,000	19,38,711
2.	R-10	9880	06.02.2007	2K	1,25,000	5,00,000
3.	R-6	1491	09.05.2007	2K	4,50,000	18,00,000

4.	R-7	2711	08.06.2007	90 Sq. Yards	36,000	19,36,000
5.	R-8	2716	08.06.2007	579 Sq. Yards	2,32,000	19,39,343

Village Para

(Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)

6.	P-1/P-10	1285	15.05.2006	17K-8.75M	92,63,671	43,49,779
7.	P-10	1919	01.06.2006	5K-3.33M	27,44,850	42,50,227
8.	P-11	3743	24.07.2006	5K-7M	28,59,000	42,75,140
9.	P-2	1394	17.05.2006	4K-0.25M	21,31,500	42,49,719
10.	P-27	1672	25.05.2006	1K – 13M	29,95,000	1,45,21,212
11.	P-3	1492	19.05.2006	8K	42,00,000	42,00,000
12.	P-6, P-3, P-6,	3797	27.07.2006	1K-16M	9,61,875	42,75,000
13	P-4	1498	19.05.2006	4K-17M	24,25,000	40,00,000
14.	P-5, P-7, P-12	3832	27.07.2006	41K-13.4M	2,23,97,625	43,00,000
15.	P-62	36	03.04.2006	4K – 16M	21,00,000	35,00,000
16.	P-63	14875	30.03.2006	7K – 19.45M	34,90,156	35,02,194
17.	P-64	171	10.04.2006	16K	71,00,000	35,50,000
18.	P-65	14874	30.03.2006	7K – 14.57M	33,81,218	34,99,999
19.	P-7	2844	26.06.2006	6K-4M	32,72,050	42,22,000
20.	P-8, P-11	1395	17.05.2006	10K-6.66M	54,89,600	42,50,150
21.	P-9, P-9	1803	29.05.2006	5K-6.6.M	28,19,500	42,31,894
22.	R-6	1956	01.06.2006	6K – 3M	11,55,000	15,02,439
23.	R-7	12327	27.01.2006	4K	2,50,000	5,00,000
24.	R-8	13322	21.02.2006	4K	2,50,000	5,00,000

Revenue Estate Rohtak

(Sale Deeds Produced by the respective parties)

25.	P-1, P-4, P-17	1627	24.05.2006	5.5 Biswa	7,30,000	42,47,272
26.	P-12, P-6	1413	17.05.2006	11 Bigha	2,92,18,750	42,50,000
27.	P-13	1636	24.05.2006	2 Bigha-12.11 Biswa	69,20,000	42,49,472
28.	P-15	1625	24.05.2006	9.2 Biswa	12,21,875	42,50,000
29.	P-16	1631	24.05.2006	4.6 Biswa	6,11,000	42,50,434
30.	P-19	1500	19.05.2006	3 Bigha – 3 Biswa	83,67,000	42,49,904
31.	P-2, P-18, P-8	1628	24.05.2006	13.8 Biswa	18,32,800	42,49,971
32.	P-20	1501	19.05.2006	11 Biswa	14,60,000	42,47,272
33.	P-22	2845	26.06.2006	2 Bigha – 7.5 Biswa	62,67,031	42,21,999
34.	P-23	2863	26.06.2006	3 Bigha – 2.5 Biswa	82,46,094	42,22,000
35.	P-24	1881	31.5.2006	1 Bigha – 6.2 Biswa	34,79,687	42,49,999
36.	P-25, P-28	1882	31.05.2006	3 Bigha – 2.5 Biswa	83,00,781	42,49,999

37.	P-26	1997	02.06.2006	16.43 Biswa	21,81,311	42,48,445
38.	P-4, P-5, P-14	1802	29.05.2006	11 Biswa	14,69,000	42,73,454
39.	P-1, P-21	2865	26.06.2006	1 Bigha – 18.67 Biswa	51,00,704	42,20,908
40.	P-2, P-5, P-6	1413	17.05.2006	11 Bigha	2,92,18,750	42,50,000
41.	P-3	905	04.05.2006	1 Bigha – 19 Biswa	39,00,000	32,00,000
42.	P-3, P-7, P-27	1885	31.05.2006	2 Bigha – 17 Biswa	75,70,000	42,49,824
43.	P-4	831	03.05.2006	2 Bigha – 14 ½ Biswa	52,69,038	39,30,284
44.	R-6	7156	17.11.2006	16 Biswa	7,50,000	15,00,000
45.	R-7	2861	26.06.2006	2 Biswa	93,000	14,88,000
46.	R-8	5389	19.09.2006	5 Biswa	2,35,000	15,04,000
47.	R-9	13443	24.02.2006	13 Biswa	2,57,000	6,32,615

In revenue estate of Rohtak, the agricultural land is in Bigha (pukhta), Bigha (kutcha) Biswa (pukhta) and Biswa (kutcha). 1 Bigha (pukhta) comprises of 3025 sq. yards which is equivalent to 100 marlas land whereas 1 Biswa(pukhta) is equivalent to 151.25 sq. yards. In the tabulated information extracted above, a Bigha of a land is equivalent to 3025 sq. yards as these are all Bigha(pukhta)

4. Arguments advanced by the respective counsels

4.1 Heard learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the various awards passed by the RC on 17.09.2014, 25.08.2015, 30.10.2015 and 11.04.2016 alongwith the record of evidence produced by the respective parties before all the four RCs. They have also filed synopsis alongwith the gist of their arguments.

4.2 Learned counsel representing the landowners while criticizing the various judgments of the RC referred to above, have contended that while assessing the market value of acquired land, the RC has erred in applying a deduction of 34/35% from the base value. While elaborating, they contend that the RC even after recording a finding that comparable sale exemplars of the contemporaneous periods have been produced, proceeded to deduct 35%. While relying upon the judgment passed in **Mehrawal Khewaji Trust vs. State of Punjab (2012) 5 SCC 432**, the learned counsels have contended that the sale exemplar with respect to highest price is to be relied upon to assess the market value of the acquired land. It is further contended that the RC has also erred in refusing to grant escalation for the period of gap between the date of sale exemplar and the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. It is also contended that the RC while dismissing the reference petitions of village Bhaiyyapur committed a mistake in overlooking the sale instances of adjoining villages, which were comparable.

4.3 Per contra, learned State counsel has contended that the sale deeds of land located in one village cannot be considered for assessing market value of the acquired land located in some other village. They further contend that the RC has correctly separately decided the cases village wise. It is further contended that the deduction on account of development cost should not be less than 50% because a very large chunk of land has been acquired. It has further been contended that the sale deeds produced by the State have been wrongly ignored while passing the awards on 25.08.2015, 30.10.2015 and 11.04.2016.

5. Discussion by this Court

5.1 Before proceeding further, it is considered appropriate to briefly discuss the reasons recorded by the RC in the various awards dated 17.09.2014, 25.08.2015, 30.10.2015 and 11.04.2016.

Award (17.09.2014)

5.2 Let us first take up the award dated 17.09.2014 passed by the RC while deciding two reference petitions relating to the land located in village Bhaiyyapur. The RC, after noticing that the sale deeds of the village Sukhpura, Para, Chunipura, Rohtak have been produced by the landowners observed that since these sale instances are with respect to the land located in different villages, therefore, they cannot be relied upon. The RC also observed that through these sale deeds produced by the landowners, the various real estate companies have purchased the land. The RC further noticed that sale exemplars Ex.R6 to R-10 are with respect to the land located in village Bhaiyyapur and the price reflected is not beyond Rs.20,00,000/- per acre. Hence, the RC dismissed the petition while relying upon the sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana.

Analysis by this Court of Award 17.09.2014:-

5.3 It is evident from the careful reading of the judgment passed by the RC that the court was not awake to the geographical location of the acquired land viz-a-viz the location of the various parcels of land in the sale deeds produced by the owners. Moreover, the RC also did not record a finding that sale exemplar from Ex.R-6 to R-10 produced by the State are comparable sale instances of the contemporaneous period.

Award (25.08.2015)

5.4 Now, let us analyze the reasons given by the RC vide award dated 25.08.2015 while deciding cases relating to revenue estate, Rohtak. The RC found that sale exemplar Ex.P1 to P4, P-27, P-28 are with respect to various parcels of land sold in the area of revenue estate, Rohtak, which are proximate to the acquired land. The RC further noticed that various real estate developing companies have purchased the land on an average price of Rs.40,27,000/- per acre. Thereafter, the RC applied 35% cut for development of infrastructural facilities like roads and sewerages, taking into consideration the development expenditure and waiting period. Thereafter, the RC deducted a sum of Rs.8,27,000/- from the average price of Rs.40,27,000/- to arrive at a figure of Rs.32,00,000/- per acre. The RC held that the landowners of the acquired land located upto the depth of 1 acre from the National Highway shall be entitled to market value at the rate of Rs.32,00,000/- per acre. Further, the RC again applied deduction of 35% for assessing the market value of the acquired land located beyond the depth of 1 acre from the National Highway to arrive at a figure of Rs.26,18,000/- per acre.

Analysis by this Court of Award 25.08.2015:-

5.5 It is evident from the reading of the impugned award that the RC did not realize that comparable sale deeds of contemporaneous period have been produced by the landowners to prove the market value of acquired land. It may be noted here that the landowners have produced a sale deed is with respect to 6.875 acre of land, which is of a sufficiently large parcel of the land. This parcel of land has been sold at the rate of Rs.42,50,000/- per acre. Even remaining sale instances produced by the landowners are not with respect to small parcels of land.

Further, the RC did not visualize the geographical location of various parcels of land which were sold through sale deeds Ex.P1 to P4, P27 and P28.

Award (30.10.2015)

5.6 Now, let us discuss the reasons given by the RC in the award dated 30.10.2015 while deciding reference applications of Village Para. The RC observed that sale instances Ex.P12 to P16 cannot be considered as these relate to the sale of various parcels of land located in different villages. Thereafter, the RC worked out the average price of sale instances Ex.P1 to P11, P27, 62 and 65 at Rs.41,83,000/- per acre. Thereafter, the RC assumed that the sale deeds are with respect to various parcels of land in the more developed areas and therefore, decided to deduct 34 % from the average base value. Thereafter, the RC granted escalation at the rate of 7.5% per annum for a period of 6 months and arrived at a figure of Rs.32,00,000/- per acre, for the acquired land located upto the depth of 1 acre from the National Highway, whereas, the land beyond the depth of 1 acre was assessed at Rs.28,65,000/- per acre.

Analysis by this Court of Award 30.10.2015:-

5.7 In the award dated 11.04.2016, the RC followed the assessment of the Court in the previous award dated 25.08.2015.

5.8. It is evident that the RC did not notice that the acquired land is in a compact rectangular block. The RC further erred in overlooking the fact that there is no physical boundary between the villages and therefore, the RC was required to be aware about the geographical location of the various parcels of the acquired land viz-a-viz that of the sale exemplars.

6. Discussion by this Court

6.1 It may be noted here that both the parties have produced various lay out plans/sectoral plan of Sector 36A prepared by the officials of the Haryana Urban Development Authority based upon revenue lay out plan. Ex.P-2 is the layout plan in the files pertaining to the record of award dated 11.04.2016. In the aforesaid layout plan, the various parcels of the land covered by the sale deeds produced by the landowners are depicted to be forming a part of the acquired land. In the record of RC's award dated 30.10.2015, two layout plans Ex.P1 and R9 have been produced. Similarly, in the RC's record of award dated 25.08.2015, three layout plans Ex.P30, P32 and R10 have been produced. In Ex.R10, the various parcels of land sold through the various sale deeds produced by the State have been marked. It also shows that some sale deeds are part of the acquired land. In the RC's record of the award dated 17.09.2014, relating to village Bhaiyyapur, Ex.R11 is the site plan. During the course of arguments, it was considered appropriate to get a comprehensive layout plan depicting the area sold through the various sale deeds produced by all the respective parties in all these cases. With the consent of the learned counsel representing the parties, the Patwari of the area was requested to produce layout plan while marking the various parcels of land sold through the sale deeds produced by the respective parties. The same on being produced has been taken on record as Ex.'C'. On a careful study of the aforesaid layout plan, it is evident that the acquired land in these three revenue estates namely Rohtak, Para and Bhaiyyapur is a compact rectangular block. On the Eastern side of the acquired land there is a Northern bye pass road which is 75 metre wide. On the Southern side, there is a railway track. On the Western side, there is a peripheral 60 metres wide road. Sector 37 is located on its Northern side. It is also evident that various parcels of land sold through the various sale deeds completely form a part of the acquired land and a tabulated compilation of the same is presented as under:-

Sr.No.	**Exhibit Nos.**	**Sale Deed No.**	**Date**	**Total Area**	**Price Per Acre**	**Village**
1	P-1	1285	15.05.2006	17K-8.75M	43,49,779	Pada (in Notification u/s 4 Para (in Judicial Record)
2	P-2	1394	17.05.2006	4K-0.25M	42,49,719	Para
3	P-10	1919	01.06.2006	5K-3.33M	42,50,227	Para
4	P-12	1413	17.05.2006	11 Bigha	42,50,000	Rohtak
5	P-13	1636	24.05.2006	2 Bigha-12.11 Biswa	42,49,472	Rohtak
6	P-14	1802	29.05.2006	11 Biswa	42,73,454	Rohtak
7	P-15	1625	24.05.2006	9.2 Biswa	42,50,000	Rohtak
8	P-16	1631	24.05.2006	4.6 Biswa	42,50,434	Rohtak
9	P-17	1627	24.05.2006	5.5 Biswa	42,47,272	Rohtak
10	P-18	1628	24.05.2006	13.8 Biswa	42,49,971	Rohtak
11	P-20	1501	19.05.2006	11 Biswa	42,47,272	Rohtak
12	P-23	2863	26.06.2006	3 Bigha – 2.5 Biswa	42,22,000	Rohtak
13	P-24	1881	31.5.2006	1 Bigha – 6.3 Biswa	42,33,839	Rohtak
14	P-25	1882	31.05.2006	3 Bigha – 2.5 Biswa	42,49,999	Rohtak
15	P-26	1997	02.06.2006	16.43 Biswa	42,48,445	Rohtak
16	P-27 Mark-A3	1885	31.05.2006	2 Bigha – 17 Biswa	42,49,824	Rohtak
17	P-3	1492	19.05.2006	8K	42,00,000	Para

18	P-4	1498	19.05.2006	4K-17M	40,00,000	Para
19	P-6	3797	27.07.2006	1K-16M	42,75,000	Para
20	P-63	14875	30.03.2006	7K – 19.45M	35,02,194	Para
21	P-64	171	10.04.2006	16K	35,50,000	Para
22	P-65	14874	30.03.2006	7K – 14.57M	34,99,999	Para
23	P-8	1395	17.05.2006	10K-6.66M	42,50,150	Para
24	P-9	1803	29.05.2006	5K-6.6.M	42,31,894	Para
25	P-7	2844	26.06.2006	6 K-4M	42,22,000	Para

6.2 It may be noted here that not only the area covered by the sale deeds produced by the landowners is part of the acquired land but the various parcels of land sold through the sale deeds produced by the State are also part of the acquired land. Further, some of the parcels of land sold through the following sale deeds produced by the landowners partially form a part of the acquired land:-

Sr. No	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No.	Date	Total Area	Price Per Acre	Village
1	P-5	3832	27.07.2006	41K-13.4M	43,00,000	Para
2	P-19	1500	19.05.2006	3 Bigha – 3 Biswa	42,49,904	Rohtak
3	P-1	2865	26.06.2006	1 Bigha – 18.67 Biswa	42,20,908	Rohtak

6.3 Through all these sale deeds referred to above, a very large chunk of land has been purchased by the various real estates development companies in order to create a land Bank so as to use it for developing a big colony. From a perusal of the aforesaid sale deeds, it is evident that the land has been sold at a price of Rs.42,50,000/- per acre approximately. All these sale deeds are with respect to the period between May to June, 2006 i.e around six months prior to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. Now, let us examine the various sale deeds produced by the State.

6.4 As far as sale deeds no.1956, 12327 and 13322 produced by the State with respect to land located in village Para is concerned, it is important to note that the aforesaid sale instances pertain to land comprised in rectangle no.71 whereas the acquired land of village Para is from rectangle no.5, 6, 7 and 13, 14, 15, and 21. The land comprised in rectangle no.71 is not a part of the layout plan and therefore, it is not possible to compare its location.

6.5 Similarly, sale deed no. 3797 dated 27.07.2006 is with respect to 1 kanal and 16 marlas of land which is also of a comparatively small area. Further, the sale instance (dated 17.11.2006) bearing no. 7156 with respect to land measuring 16 biswas and sale deed no. 263 (dated 26.06.2006) is part of the acquired land. Similarly, sale deed no. 2861 (dated 26.06.2006) with respect to land measuring 2 biswas is also a part of the acquired land. Similar is the position with respect to sale deed no. 5389 (dated 19.09.2006). However, these sale deeds are not only stray sale deeds but also with respect to a comparatively small area. Further, as already noticed, the landowners are entitled to expect highest price of the land and therefore, the Court should not deny them the aforesaid benefit particularly when the land has been taken away compulsorily. Hence, the aforesaid sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana are not found appropriate to rely upon to assess the market value. There are sale deeds which are consistently reflecting the price at the rate of Rs.42,50,000/- approximately. In fact, there are as many as 10 sale deeds reflecting consistent price at the rate of Rs.42,50,000 per acre, therefore, this Court has no difficulty in assessing the market value at the same rate.

6.6 Further, a bare look at the layout plan produced by the State in the High Court shows that the sale instances Ex.R6, R7, R8 and R9 with respect to village Bhaiyyapur are at a sufficient distance from the acquired land. In fact, these parcels of land are located on the other side of the railway line and that also at a distant place. Similarly, sale deeds produced by the State bearing no. 1956, 12327 and 13322 relating to the parcels of land located in village Para are not shown to be a part of the acquired land. Moreover, the sale instances are R6, R7 and R8 are depicted to be far away across the peripheral road located on the western side. Hence, it will not be appropriate to asses the market value of the acquired land on the basis of sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana.

6.7 Now this Bench proceeds to discuss on the question of deduction on account of development cost or the area required for carving out roads, streets, parks and other common facilities. This aspect has been examined by this Court in detail in **Jai Singh vs. State of Haryana and others, RFA no. 3000/2016 decided on 15.11.2021**. The relevant discussion on this aspect is extracted 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."

6.8 Further, the additional judgments relied upon by the State counsel have been elaborately discussed while deciding the appeal in **'Sant Ram and others vs. State of Haryana and others' RFA 6193/2015 decided on 17.02.2022** in the following manner:-

5.3.1 This Court has carefully and respectfully read the judgments relied upon by the State's counsel. In ***Ram Kanwar's case (Supra)***, the Supreme Court while upholding the order of the High Court noticed that there was an abnormal increase of more than 100% within a period of less than four months. In that context, the Court observed that such a sale deed could not be relied upon without making the necessary deductions to assess the market value at par with the estimated market value of the acquired land. In the respectful opinion of the Court, such observations do not mean that in each and every case, the deduction/cut is mandatory. This Bench has also carefully read the judgment passed in ***Kasturi (Supra)*** in which the land was acquired to develop Sectors 13 and 23 at Bhiwani. The High Court relied upon the sale instance (Ex. P-7) with respect to land measuring 3 Kanal located on the main road which is claimed to be have the potential to be used for

> commercial purposes. The High Court applied a deduction of 20% after finding that the sale instance relied upon is not similar to the acquired land. The Supreme Court, while dismissing the appeal, approved the decision of the High Court. In the considered opinion of the court, the Supreme Court approved the decision of the High Court on the ground that there was a dissimilarity between the parcel of land covered by the sale instance and the acquired land. In the humble opinion of this Court, the aforesaid judgments in ***Ram Kanwar's case (supra)*** and ***Kasturi's case (supra)*** do not, as a ratio decidendi, lay down, that even if the comparable sale exemplars of contemporaneous period have been produced, still, it is necessary to apply some amount of deduction. Deduction is to be applied in a case where the Court finds that there is a dissimilarity between the acquired land and the land sold through the concerned sale exemplar."

6.9 It may be noted here that there is no physical boundary between the agricultural land of various villages. The land between the two villages can be in continuity if the owner owns the continuous parcel of land in both the villages or it can be divided by a few inches or one foot wide earthern dividing line or killa line which is few inches higher than the agricultural land on which at one point of time only one person can barely walk. It is similar to the dividing boundary marked by the various owners while segregating their land from the neighbour. There is no material to prove that when all other parameters are equal, only with the location of the land in one village or other contiguous villages the market value of various parcels of land located in different villages change significantly irrespective of the fact that these parcels are contiguous.

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. R-27 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, re-interated 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.

6.13 It is evident from the perusal of the table that most of the sale deeds of the acquired land, information whereof is compiled in para 6.1 are in the price ranging from Rs.42,50,000/- per acre. Ex.P14 is a sale instance of 11 biswas of land which has been sold at the rate of Rs.42,73,454/- However, this is a small piece of land as compared to the various other sale instances. Hence, it would not be appropriate to rely upon Ex.P14. In the present case, the notification under Section 4 is of 15.12.2006 whereas most of the sale instances of the acquired land are with respect to sale during the month of May or June 2006. Thus, there is a gap of six months. Hence, the landowners are held entitled to escalation of the market value for this 6 months period at the rate of 10% per annum, which works out to Rs.44,62,500/- per acre

7. Decision:-

Accordingly, these appeals are allowed while assessing the market value of the acquired land as on 15.12.2006 at rate of Rs.44,62,500/-per acre.

02.03.2022 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
rekha **JUDGE**
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

Sr. No.	Case No.	Petitioner's name	Respondent's name
1.	RFA-1929-2016	SMT. CHHOTI DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
2.	RFA-1235-2016	RK KHANNA	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
3.	RFA-435-2016	KARAN SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
4.	RFA-1229-2016	PHOOLAWANTI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
5.	RFA-2525-2016	SIRI PAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
6.	RFA-1230-2016	RAJNI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
7.	RFA-2246-2016	KRISHAN LAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
8.	RFA-2871-2016	SUNITA AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
9.	RFA-469-2016	AZAD SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
10.	RFA-2442-2017	RAM KARAN AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
11.	RFA-1003-2016	RAM BHAGAT AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
12.	RFA-1999-2016	RISAL SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
13.	RFA-2792-2016	SUNDER LAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

14.	RFA-1233-2016	SUSHIL KUMARI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
15.	RFA-618-2016	KULDEEP KUMAR @ KULDEEP SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
16.	RFA-1232-2016	KITABO	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
17.	RFA-619-2016	PUNEET	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
18.	RFA-1227-2016	VED PRAKASH	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
19.	RFA-2443-2017	YOGENDER KUMAR AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
20.	RFA-433-2016	SATBIR SINGH AND OTHER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
21.	RFA-1231-2016	URMIL SHARMA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
22.	RFA-2182-2016	JAGBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
23.	RFA-24-2016	VIPIN KHANNA	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
24.	RFA-2157-2016	CHARAN SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
25.	RFA-2524-2016	RAMESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
26.	RFA-4435-2016	RAJ KUMAR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
27.	RFA-2444-2017	PARVATI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
28.	RFA-718-2016	HARINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
29.	RFA-630-2016	SMT. MUKESH LATA	STATE OF HARYANA
30.	RFA-3390-2017	KRISHNA	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
31.	RFA-1226-2016	PUSHPA SIKKA	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
32.	RFA-4085-2016	SURJEET AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
33.	RFA-2158-2016	CHUNNI LAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
34.	RFA-1234-2016	KRISHAN LAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
35.	RFA-1228-2016	HARPAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
36.	RFA-460-2016	M/S JYOTIMA COLONISERS PVT LTD	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
37.	RFA-4963-2016	WAZIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
38.	RFA-1143-2016	M/S DIPESH REALTORS PVT LTD	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
39.	RFA-4958-2016	NARESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
40.	RFA-2310-2016	PARTAP & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
41.	RFA-5312-2017	SHANTI DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
42.	RFA-1730-2017	PARTAP SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

43.	RFA-1144-2016	M/S ASHWAMEDHA COLONISERS PVT LTD	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
44.	RFA-4961-2016	RAJESH OHLAN	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
45.	RFA-4964-2016	JAIPAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
46.	RFA-2684-2016	SUBHASH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
47.	RFA-2485-2021	ZILE SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
48.	RFA-159-2017	SHALLU OHLAN	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
49.	RFA-1142-2016	M/S SHYAMLI PROJECTS PVT LTD	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
50.	RFA-1930-2016	JAGDISH CHAND & ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
51.	RFA-4962-2016	RAJPAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
52.	RFA-4959-2016	JAGDISH	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
53.	RFA-2685-2016	RAGHVINDER SINGH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
54.	RFA-4960-2016	SUSHMA	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
55.	RFA-1545-2016	SATPRIA & ANR	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
56.	RFA-459-2016	M/S BANSIWALA REALTORS PVT LTD	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
57.	RFA-1359-2017	SHEKHAR CHAND DECEASED TH LRS AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
58.	RFA-458-2016	M/S SATKARTAR REALTORS PVT LTD	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
59.	RFA-1171-2016	PRAKASH RANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
60.	RFA-1225-2016	GIAN CHAND	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
61.	RFA-4458-2016	SMT. VIDYAWANTI	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
62.	RFA-1004-2016	SMT. SUNITA	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
63.	RFA-1267-2016	ATTAM PRAKASH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
64.	RFA-1902-2016	RAJ RANI	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
65.	RFA-1562-2016	RAMESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
66.	RFA-3941-2016	KAPUR CHAND AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
67.	RFA-2159-2016	SHANTA DITTI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
68.	RFA-4012-2016	SHYAM SUNDER AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
69.	RFA-2755-2016	SMT. VIDYAWANTI	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
70.	RFA-2179-2016	MANGE RAM AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
71.	RFA-1015-2016	VIJAY SINGH AND ORS.	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

72.	RFA-1901-2016	SUSHILA DAHIYA (DECEASED) THR LR	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
73.	RFA-1017-2016	JIWANI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
74.	RFA-1005-2016	RANJIT SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
75.	RFA-1172-2016	SHER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
76.	RFA-2160-2016	KRISHNA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
77.	RFA-2754-2016	RANDHIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
78.	RFA-2756-2016	VEDPAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
79.	RFA-379-2017	VEDPAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
80.	RFA-1563-2016	SUKHDEV SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
81.	RFA-2162-2016	RAHEESH AHMED	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
82.	RFA-1564-2016	HAWA SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
83.	RFA-2753-2016	VEDPAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
84.	RFA-1016-2016	RAJMAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
85.	RFA-1114-2018	RAJINDER AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
86.	RFA-1022-2016	BUDH RAM	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
87.	RFA-2097-2016	JAGDISH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
88.	RFA-1568-2016	BIMLA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
89.	RFA-4667-2016	M/S SATKARTAR REALTORS PVT.LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
90.	RFA-1573-2016	MEENU	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
91.	RFA-487-2016	SURESH KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
92.	RFA-1574-2016	RAJBIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
93.	RFA-1570-2016	SURENDER KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
94.	RFA-1566-2016	JAGBIR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
95.	RFA-1571-2016	HAR PIYARI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
96.	RFA-4664-2016	M/S VARADRAJ BUILDWELL PVT.LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
97.	RFA-1117-2018	OM PARKASH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
98.	RFA-1020-2016	PARVEEN KUMAR AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
99.	RFA-1569-2016	PREM SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
100.	RFA-1815-2016	PARVEEN KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

101.	RFA-295-2018	PARMOD KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
102.	RFA-1014-2016	FATEH SINGH AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
103.	RFA-1021-2016	RAMPHAL AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
104.	RFA-1536-2021	KANHIYA LAL SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRS AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
105.	RFA-1215-2016	BHALE RAM AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
106.	RFA-1572-2016	SUNEHRI DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
107.	RFA-2105-2016	SUNITA	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
108.	RFA-4665-2016	M/S BANSIWALA REALTORS PVT.LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
109.	RFA-1711-2018	KRISHAN AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
110.	RFA-1118-2018	SATBIR SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
111.	RFA-1019-2016	RISAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
112.	RFA-1567-2016	ASHOK KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
113.	RFA-2462-2017	M/S SONIKA PROPERTIES PVT.LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
114.	RFA-1116-2018	RAM PARKASH @ OM PARKASH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
115.	RFA-1991-2016	CHARAN DASS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
116.	RFA-4666-2016	M/S NACHIKETA PROJECTS PVT.LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
117.	RFA-1018-2016	RAMESHWAR AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
118.	RFA-4661-2016	M/S SAMDARSHI PROMOTERS & DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
119.	RFA-1259-2021	SURENDER AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
120.	RFA-4663-2016	MS/ DIPESH REALTORS PVT.LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.
121.	RFA-1565-2016	MOTI LAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
122.	RFA-4662-2016	M/S JYOTIMA COLONISERS PVT.LTD.	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
123.	RFA-4453-2016	RANDHIR SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
124.	RFA-1161-2016	RAJ MADAAN	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
125.	RFA-1168-2016	KHAIRATI LAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
126.	RFA-1163-2016	KRISHAN CHANDER	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
127.	RFA-1166-2016	KRISHAN LAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
128.	RFA-1514-2017	YOGENDER AND ANR	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

129.	RFA-2002-2016	SMT. SUNIL KUMARI	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
130.	RFA-1900-2016	CHAND RAM (DECEASED) THRO LRS	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
131.	RFA-2001-2016	NATHO DEVI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
132.	RFA-1516-2017	RAJPAL SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
133.	RFA-2178-2016	DHANPATI AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
134.	RFA-1990-2016	JAI SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
135.	RFA-2156-2016	SURAJ PRAKASH	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
136.	RFA-2982-2016	OMBIR AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
137.	RFA-1164-2016	SUSHILA DEVI	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
138.	RFA-3238-2017	SATOSH KUMARI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
139.	RFA-1560-2016	DEVINDER KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
140.	RFA-1167-2016	SMT. NEELAM	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
141.	RFA-1162-2016	MOHINDER LAL	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
142.	RFA-2000-2016	JASWANT AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
143.	RFA-2161-2016	KAMLESH RANI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
144.	RFA-1165-2016	KASHMIRI LAL	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
145.	RFA-1561-2016	SMT. USHA	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
146.	RFA-1170-2016	SHEELA WANTI	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
147.	RFA-1515-2017	NAFE SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
148.	RFA-4102-2016	SURJEET AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA ETC
149.	RFA-2683-2017	KARTAR SINGH AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
150.	RFA-2752-2016	SIDHESHWAR @ SUDESHWAR	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
151.	RFA-1512-2017	RAJINDER SINGH	STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
152.	RFA-1513-2017	NARENDER SINGH @ NARENDER KUMAR AND ORS	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
153.	RFA-1559-2016	ANIL KUMAR	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS
154.	RFA-1169-2016	RAMESH CHANDER	STATE OF HARYANA & ORS

02.03.2022 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
rekha **JUDGE**