

**RFA-2349-2018 (O&M)
and connected cases**

1

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

RFA-2349-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.08.2022
Reserved on: 04.08.2022

Natha Singh

....Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Shailendra Jain, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Satyendra Chauhan, Advocate

Mr. J.S.Thind, Advocate
Mr. Shubham, Advocate
Mr. P.K.Ganga, Advocate
Mr. Ashwani Bakshi, Advocate
Mr. Gaurav Aggarwal, Advocate
Mr. Dheeraj Narula, Advocate
Mr. Sandeep Punchi, Advocate
Mr. K.S.Godara, Advocate
Mr. Kartar Singh, Advocate
Mr. C.L.Premy, Advocate
Ms. Amarjit Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. P.S.Jammu, Advocate
for the landowners

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, AAG, Haryana

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

1. Background and Introduction

1.1 A batch of 114 appeals filed with a prayer to modify the common award passed by the Reference Court on 20.01.2018 has come up for hearing. The notifications under Section 4, 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') the awards passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to

as the ‘LAC’) as well as the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as ‘RC’) are common. Learned counsel representing the parties are ad idem that these appeals can conveniently be disposed of by a common judgment.

1.2 The relevant particulars of these cases are:-

23.08.2010	Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 proposing to acquire the land of three villages namely Vaidwala, Sikanderpur and Moriwala for public purpose namely sewerage treatment plant Sirsa was issued.
16.08.2003	Award dated 16.08.2013 the LAC while announcing award no.4 offered to pay the market value at the rate of Rs.40,00,000/- per acres to the landowners. The total land acquired is 42.28 acres.
20.01.2018	The RC has assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.62,00,000/- per acre

1.3 In order to project the potentiality of the land, the landowners have stated that the acquired land is situated adjacent to the developed sectors of HUDA, ERA Group, Housing Board Colony and Global Colony. A commercial booth in Sector 20, HUDA measuring 9x27 feet has been sold in auction for more than R.40,00,000/-. The National College, District Courts, Mini Secretariat, Police Post, Khairpur, Housing Board as well as the commercial establishments, inter State Bus Terminal, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Stadium of International Level, The Sirsa School, Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Vidyapeeth and some marriage palaces have been constructed in and around the acquired land, therefore, the acquired land has a very high potential for

the commercial use.

1.4 The State of Haryana while contesting has suggested that the amount offered by the LAC is correct.

1.5 The RC on examination of the pleadings, has culled out the following issues:-

- “1. What was the prevailing market price of the acquired land as on the date of notification under section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act? OPP.
2. Whether the petitioners are entitled to enhancement of compensation, on the grounds mentioned in the petition prayed for?OPP.
3. Relief.”

2. Oral and Documentary Evidence:-

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

PW1	G.S.Pruthi, Registered Architect
PW2	Shahbaj Singh
PW3	Narinder Singh
PW4	Sanjeev Bharti
PW5	Richhpal Singh, Clerk o/o Haryana Khadi and Village Gramo Udhogh Board, Sirsa
PW6	Harbans Singh
PW7	Kanwaljeet Singh
PW8	Rajinder Singh
PW9	Baldev Singh
PW10	Jagdish Chander Mal, Patwari
PW11	Ms. Pooja Rani
PW13	Jarnail Ram
PW15	Anshi Lal, Registry Clerk
PW16	Ramesh Kumar
PW17	Kewal Singh
PW18	Inderjeet Bhalla
PW19	Er.N.K.Gupta, Surveyor, Loss Assessor

PW20	Anil Kumar
PW21	Smt. Anudeep

2.2 In the documentary evidence, they have produced the following documents:-

Ex.P1	Location plan
Ex.P2	Location plan
Ex.P3	Photocopy of objection
Ex.P4	Attested copy of sale deed
Ex.P5	Attested copy of sale deed
Ex.P6	Attested copy of sale deed
Ex.P7	Certified copy of Award dt. 6.12.2013 passed by Sh.Sandeep Singh the then ADJ, Sirsa
Ex.PW3/B	Certified copy of sale deed no.358 dt. 18.4.2007
Ex.PW4/B	Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW5/A	Certified copy of Award no.28 dt. 8.7.2016
Ex.PW6/B	Certified copy of Award no.4 dt. 16.8.2013
Ex.PW7/C	Notice u/s 9 of the LAC
Ex.PW7/B	Certified copy of Award no.4 dated 16.8.2013
Ex.PW7/D	Jamabandi for the year 2011-2012
Ex.PW8/B	Certified copy of Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW8/C	Certified copy of Aks-sizra
Ex.PW8/D	Objection application to LAC Hisar
Ex.PW8/E	Copy of statement u/s 19 of the Act
Ex.PW8/F	Notice u/s 9 of the Act
Ex.P9/B	Copy of Aks sizra
Ex.P9/C	Certified copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P9/D	Copy of objection application LAC HUDA Hisar
Ex.P9/E	Copy of Award no.4 dt. 16.8.2013
Ex.P9/F	Copy of notice u/s 19 of the Act
Ex.P1	Photo copy of letter regarding interview of loan
Ex.P2	Photo copy of letter regarding termws and conditions of loan amount

**RFA-2349-2018 (O&M)
and connected cases**

Ex.P3	Photo copy of entrance and confirmation of mutation
Ex.P4	Mortgage deed No.2094 dt. 30.5.2005
Ex.P6	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2006-2007
Ex.P7	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P8	Certified copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P9	Certified copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.P10	Notice u/s 9 of Natha Singh
Ex.P11	Notice u/s 19 of Natha Singh
Ex.P12	Certified copy of jamabandi for the years 2012
Ex.P13	Aks Sizra Notice u/s 9 of Malagar Singh
Ex.P14	Notice u/s 9 of Malagar Singh
Ex.P15	Statement u/s 19
Ex.P16	GPA in favour of Ashok Kumar
Ex.P17	Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P18	Notice u/s 9 of the Act
Ex.P19	Statement u/s 19
Ex.P20	Certified copy of sale deed no.7494 dt. 10.2.2014
Ex.P21	Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P22	Notice u/s of the Act
Ex.P23	Statement u/s 19
Ex.P24	Notice to Dharampal etc. issued by LAC Hisar
Ex.PW12/B	Photo Copy of Roznamcha Wakayati village Vaidwala for the years 2012-2013
Ex.P12/C	Photo copy of Roznamcha Wakayati village Vaidwala for the years 2014-2015
Ex.PW 12D	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.P12/E	Certified copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P12/F	Mutation 4566
Ex.P13/B	Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW13/C	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.PW13/D	Aks Sizra of Village Sikanderpur
Ex.PW13/E	Notice to Gopi Chand by LAC Hisar
Ex.PW13/F	Notice u/s 9 of the Act
Ex.PW13/G	Statement u/s 19
Ex.P25	Copy of GPA of Sarwan Kumar

Ex.P26	Copy of GPA of Sukhwinder Singh
Ex.P27	Copy of Jamabandi for the year 2011-2012
Ex.P25/A to Ex.P27/A	Three copies for proof of site plan
Ex.P28	Certified copy of Mortgage deed
Ex.P29	Collector rate
Ex.P30	Certified copy of mutation no.3839
Ex.P31	Certified copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.P32	Copy of statement u/s 19 of the Act
Ex.P33	Notice U/s 9 of LAC Act
Ex.PW16/B	Mutation
Ex.PW16/C	Certified copy of statement no.19
Ex.PW17/B	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW17/C	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW17/D	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.PW17/E	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.PW17/F	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.PW17/G	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW17/H	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW17/I	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.PW17/J	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.PW18B	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.PW19/B	Report of Surveyor, Los Assesser
Ex.P34	Copy of sale deed no.9105 dt. 7.2.2013
Ex.P35	Copy of jamabandi for the years 2012-2013
Ex.P36	Copy of Aks Sizra
Ex.P37	Copy of Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P38	Certified copy of Site plan
Ex.P39	Copy of sale deed no.7494 dt. 10.2.2014
Ex.P40	Copy of sale deed no.7494 dt. 10.2.2014
Ex.P41	Site plan
Ex.P42	Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P43	Mutation
Ex.P44	Mutation
Ex.P45	Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P46	Site plan
Ex.P47	Certified copy of site plan village Vaidwala

Ex.P48	Certified copy of site plan village Vaidwala
Ex.P49	Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P50	Site plan of village Vaidwala
Ex.P9	Certified copy of Aks Sizra of village Vaidwala

2.3 Baldev Singh separately appeared in LAC-89-2014 and produced Ex.P-1, the certified copy of the jamabandi for the year 2011-12, Ex.P-2 attested copy of the receipt regarding STD, Sirsa and Ex.P3 photocopy of letter no.4368 dated 20.03.2013.

2.4 On the other hand, State of Haryana examined RW1, Subhash Chander, Patwari in the office of LAC, Sirsa and tendered the following documents:-

Ex.R9	Notification u/s 4 dt. 23.8.2010
Ex.R10	Notification u/s 6 dt. 19.8.2011
Ex.R11	Award no.4 dt. 16.8.2013
Mark A	Rapat Roznamcha
Mark B	Site plan

2.5 In the rebuttal evidence, the landowners produced the following documents:-

Ex.P51	Photostat copy of Award dt. 10.3.2017
Ex.P52	Certified copy of Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012
Ex.P52	Certified copy of order of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India
Ex.P53	Copy of Aks Sizra of village Moriwala
Ex.P54	Certified copy of Jamabandi for the years 2012-2013
Ex.p55	Certified copy of Jamabandi for the years 2011-2012

3. Reasons given by the Reference Court (RC):-

3.1 The RC has held that the various sale deeds produced by the

landowners cannot be relied upon as the various parcels of land represented by the sale deeds are neither comparable nor they relate to the contemporaneous period. It was also observed that the reliance of the landowners on the award dated 10.03.2017 (Ex.P51) regarding notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 15.01.2008 proposing to acquire 300.53 acres of land for developing residential and commercial Sectors 21 and 21-B, Sirsa, cannot be taken into consideration because the acquired land was meant for the development of the residential and commercial sectors. However, the RC relies upon its previous award dated 06.12.2013 Ex.P7 in '**Khan Chand and others vs. State of Haryana and others**' pertaining to assessment of the market value of the acquired land in village Vaidwala for the construction of Sirsa Bypass Road. The notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act in the aforesaid case was issued on 15.06.2009. After relying upon Ex.P7, the Court has granted 12% annual increase on account of expected escalation and held that the market value of the acquired land comes to Rs.62,00,000/- per acre.

4. Arguments made by the learned counsel representing the parties

4.1 Heard learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paperbook as well as the record of the RC which was requisitioned.

4.2 On the one hand, the landowners pray for enhancement of the market value of the acquired land while submitting that the sale instances produced by the landowners are comparable and prove that the acquired land has a high potential. While relying upon Ex.P4, P5 and

P6, they contend that no doubt, the sale instances are with regard to Village Khairpur, however, Khairpur village is adjoining the Vaidwala Villages, therefore, the court should rely upon the same.

4.3 Per contra, the learned counsel representing the State of Haryana while pressing their appeals, has contended that the reliance placed on Ex.P7 is wholly misplaced. He submits that the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act in Ex.P7 is for acquiring a narrow strip of land for constructing Sirsa Bypass Road whereas the acquired land in this case is in the form of a compact block. It has further been submitted that there was no evidence of escalation in the price of the acquired land. He further submitted that the judgment passed by the RC is perverse as the sale deeds produced by the State of Haryana have neither been noticed nor discussed by the RC. While drawing the attention of the Court to the layout plan Ex.HC-1, the learned counsel contends that sale instances Ex. R-2, R-6, R-4 are with respect to the parcels of land located nearby. He prayed for setting aside the award passed by the RC.

5. Discussion by this Court:-

5.1 With the consent of the learned counsel representing the parties, a layout plan prepared by the Local Patwari, identifying the location of various parcels of land represented by the various parties and the acquired land has been taken on record as Ex.HC-1. A careful perusal thereof is evident that the parcels of land sold through sale instances Ex.P4, P5, P6 are with respect to the parcels of the commercial land located in Village Khairpur, which is closer to the Sirsa City. It is also located on National Highway No.10, i.e from Sirsa to Hisar. From

the bare perusal of the scaled layout plan, it is evident that the aforesaid parcels of land represented by Ex.P4, P5 and P6 are at a sufficient distance from the acquired land. Hence, the RC has correctly refused to rely upon the same. Ex.P13/B is the same sale instance as Ex.P5. The landowners have also produced two more sale instances Ex.P20/P39 and Ex.P34. Both these sale instances are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act which in these cases is 23.08.2010. The market value of the land is to be assessed in accordance with its value on 23.08.2010. Hence, it would not be appropriate to rely upon the sale instances Ex.P20/P39 and P34 to determine the market value of the acquired land on 22.08.2010.

5.2 Now, this Bench proceeds to examine the sale instances produced by the State of Haryana. It may be noted here that the judgment passed by the RC suffers from perversity as the sale instances produced by the State have neither been noticed nor analysed or discussed. The RC was required to examine the sale instances produced by both the parties before proceeding to assess the market value of the acquired land. Ex.R2 is a sale instance of the land comprised in Rect.no.127/128/ 142 and 143. Whereas the majority of the acquired land is comprised of Rect.No.150 and 151. After a bare look at the layout plan, it is evident that the land represented by Ex.R2 and R3 is located at the distance of only 3 acres from the acquired land. These sale instances dated 18.01.2008 represent a sufficiently large area of land measuring more than 2 acres each. The land has been sold at the rate of Rs.7,00,000/- per acre. If we carefully examine the sale instance Ex.R6

dated 16.02.2010 it is evident that the aforesaid sale instance is representing a parcel of land which is just 1 acre away from the acquired land. This sale instance is with respect to more than 5 kanals of land comprised in Rect.no.149 whereas the acquired land is in Rect. No.150. In terms of the agricultural land, a rectangle represents a unit of land measuring 5 acres x 5 acres = 25 acres. In Northern India, while carrying out the consolidation of holdings, the land of the entire village is divided in Rectangles, Khasra Nos./Killa Nos., Kanals, Marlas and Sirsais. Each Rectangle is assigned number starting from North Eastern corner of the village and these numbers increase while going towards the North Southern Side. Thereafter, the numbers succeed the manner of a spiral. Thus, the land comprised in Rect. No.149 is adjacent to the land comprised in Rect.no.150. The Ex.R6 also shows that the land has been sold at the rate of Rs.8,00,000/- per acre.

5.3 Ex.P7 is the previous award passed by RC while assessing the market value of the acquired land for construction of Sirsa Bypass Road. In that case, the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act is 15.06.2009. The award passed by the RC in those cases is also the subject matter of appeal before this Court. It has been held by the Supreme Court in **Manoj Kumar & ors vs. State of Haryana (2018) 13 SCC 96** that the Court should not blindly rely upon the assessment of the market value with respect to some other acquisition without carefully reading the judgment and analysing the material relied therein. The relevant paragraphs 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.”

5.4 While assessing the market value of the acquired land, the court is required to look for best and direct evidence. Once the best and direct evidence is available, the court should not rely upon the indirect evidence, which though may be relevant, however, is never considered conclusive. The market value assessed by the Court is based upon the evidence produced by the parties. In other words, when the court assesses the market value of the acquired land, it is dependent upon the evidence produced by the parties. It can vary from case to case. In a particular case the quality of the evidence produced by the landowners may be very good whereas in other case, the party fails to produce the relevant evidence in support of their case. Hence, it is not always safe to rely upon the previous assessment of the market value arrived at by the court with respect to a different acquisition. On the other hand, the sale deeds are a direct piece of evidence of the market value of the acquired

land. Unless the court comes to a conclusion that the sale deed produced in evidence is neither of comparable parcel of land nor it is with respect to contemporaneous period, the court should not give preference to the assessment of the market value arrived at by the court with respect to acquisition of different parcel of land by a separate notification.

5.5 There is yet another aspect of the matter. The court while assessing the market value of a particular parcel of land for the purpose of awarding compensation of the acquired land does not grant any decree of declaration that in a particular area the market value of the land is the amount so determined. Hence, the assessment made by the court though relevant but is not binding on the court. In such circumstances, it is not appropriate for the court to rely upon the previous assessment, particularly when the direct evidence is available. The court, after carefully analysing the best evidence, shall come to a conclusion.

5.6 It may be noticed here that the learned counsel representing the landowners submit that the RC has committed an error in refusing to rely upon the previous judgment of the RC Ex.P51, which is also with respect to parcel of land located nearby. This Court has examined the aforesaid argument with reference to Ex.HC1. First of all, the State has already denotified the land or in other words, abandoned the acquisition. Secondly, the aforesaid parcel of land is located far away from the acquired land. If we carefully examine the layout plan Ex.HC1, it is evident that village Khairpur is closer to the Sirsa City whereas the Village Vaidwala comes after the boundary of Village Khairpur comes to an end. They share adjoining boundaries. Thereafter, Village

Sikanderpur is located. Even the evidence produced by the parties prove that the price of the parcels of land located near Sirsa City, which is a District Headquarter, is more whereas parcels of land located at a distance from the city are being sold for a lesser price.

6. Decision:-

6.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, it is evident that the RC has wrongly relied upon Ex.P7 to assess the market value of the acquired land particularly when the sale deed exemplars relating to various parcels of land located in and around the acquired land have been produced, which are not only comparable but also relate to the sales of the contemporaneous period. Therefore, the award passed by the LAC does not require any interference with regard to the assessment of the market value of the acquired land. Consequently, the appeals filed by the State of Haryana are allowed whereas the appeals filed by the landowners are dismissed. Resultantly, the reference applications filed by the landowners shall also stand dismissed.

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

31.08.2022
rekha
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

SR. No.	Case No.	Party Name
1.	RFA No.2349-2018	NATHA SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
2.	RFA-2679-2018	SMT. PRITAM KAUR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
3.	RFA-3198-2018	MANJIT KAUR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

RFA-2349-2018 (O&M)
and connected cases

17

4.	RFA-2353-2019	JAIMAL RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-4967-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S JAIMAL RAM & ORS
6.	RFA-3109-2018	SHAHBAJ SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
7.	RFA-3108-2018	MANMOHAN SINGH @ MICHAEL S.BATHLA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
8.	RFA-4254-2019	SWARAN KAUR @ SWARAN KAUR VADACH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
9.	RFA-4583-2018	KEWAL SINGH V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
10.	RFA-4510-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S JHANDA RAM & ANOTHER
11.	RFA-9215-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S HARBANS LAL AND ORS
12.	RFA-2713-2019	BALWINDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA
13.	RFA-4558-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S RAM SINGH & OTHERS
14.	RFA-4979-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S ASHOK KUMAR & ORS
15.	RFA-5285-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S KRISHNA DEVI & OTHERS
16.	RFA-2360-2018	RAMESH KUMAR AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
17.	RFA-3199-2018	NISHAN SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
18.	RFA-4269-2018	HARBHAJAN KAUR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
19.	RFA-4234-2019	SUMITRA INFRA DEVELOPERS PRIVATE LIMITED V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-3194-2018	PRABHJEET SINGH & ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
21.	RFA-2362-2018	DAULAT SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THRU LRS AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
22.	RFA-9206-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S BALTEJ SINGH AND ORS
23.	RFA-5191-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S KIRAN BANSAL & OTHERS
24.	RFA-4966-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA V/S CHANDI RAM & ORS
25.	RFA-2240-2019	MANJEET SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
26.	RFA-4714-2018	CHANDI RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THRU LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
27.	RFA-5189-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S KRISHNA RANI & OTHERS
28.	RFA-4660-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S SHANTI DEVI & OTHERS
29.	RFA-5186-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S AVTAR SINGH & OTHERS
30.	RFA-2352-2018	ARJAN DASS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

31.	RFA-4507-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S SWARAN KAUR KAUR @ SWARAN KAUR VADAICH AND OTHERS
32.	RFA-4652-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S SHAHBAJ SINGH & OTHERS
33.	RFA-4233-2019	NIRMAL SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
34.	RFA-3146-2018	KRISHANA DEVI AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
35.	RFA-3145-2018	HARBANS LAL AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
36.	RFA-5197-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S MANJEET SINGH & OTHERS
37.	RFA-8547-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S RAVI KANT & OTHERS
38.	RFA-4662-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S MANJIT KAUR & OTHERS
39.	RFA-4509-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S RAJENDER SINGH & OTHERS
40.	RFA-4965-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S AJAY SINGH & ORS
41.	RFA-5187-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA V/S JAGBIR SINGH & OTHERS
42.	RFA-9214-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S KEWAL SINGH AND ORS
43.	RFA-2905-2018	JOGA SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
44.	RFA-9212-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S MANMOHAN SINGH AND ORS
45.	RFA-2351-2018	AVTAR SINGH AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
46.	RFA-5185-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S NIRMAL SINGH & ANOTHER
47.	RFA-4972-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S BALDEV SINGH & ORS
48.	RFA-2906-2018	JAGBIR SINGH AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
49.	RFA-3367-2018	NARGIS @ NARGIS GURDIAL SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH COLLECTOR AND ORS
50.	RFA-4969-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S DHARAMPAL & ORS
51.	RFA-5184-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA V/S MUKAND LAL & OTHERS
52.	RFA-5196-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S SUMITRA INDRDA DEVELOPERS PRIVATE LIMITED AND ANOTHER
53.	RFA-609-2019	BIRBAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
54.	RFA-4968-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S CHAMBHA RAM & ORS
55.	RFA-2355-2018	SURESH KUMAR AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

RFA-2349-2018 (O&M)

and connected cases

19

56.	RFA-2797-2018	BALTEJ SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
57.	RFA-3235-2018	VEENA RANI @ VEENA BANSAL AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
58.	RFA-9210-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S BALTEJ SINGH AND ORS
59.	RFA-9211-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S ARJAN DASS AND ORS
60.	RFA-9205-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S BIRBAL AND ORS
61.	RFA-9207-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S KANWAL JEET SINGH AND ORS
62.	RFA-4657-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S HARBHAJAN KAUR & OTHERS
63.	RFA-9213-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA V/S SUKHWINDER SINGH AND ORS
64.	RFA-2361-2018	SUMITRA DEVI (SINCE DECEASED) THR LR AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
65.	RFA-4252-2019	RENUKA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
66.	RFA-4508-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S NEERU GARG & OTHERS
67.	RFA-5195-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S VEER SINGH & OTHERS
68.	RFA-5286-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S POOJA RANI AND ANOTHER
69.	RFA-7-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S TAHLA RAMA (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS
70.	RFA-2475-2019	DHARAM PAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
71.	RFA-4571-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S VEENA RANI @ VEENA BANSAL & ORS.
72.	RFA-4560-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S JOGA SINGH & OTHERS
73.	RFA-4561-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S ATMA RAM @ ANTU RAM & OTHERS
74.	RFA-2353-2018	RAM SINGH AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
75.	RFA-2357-2018	KANWAL JEET SINGH AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
76.	RFA-3197-2018	RAJESH KUMAR AND ANR V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
77.	RFA-4235-2019	RAJ KUMAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
78.	RFA-5284-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S ASHOK KUMAR AND OTHERS
79.	RFA-5198-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S RENUKA & ANOTHER
80.	RFA-2354-2018	NARENDER SINGH AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
81.	RFA-4665-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S PARABHJEET SINGH & OTHERS
82.	RFA-46-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER V/S BALWINDER SINGH AND ORS

RFA-2349-2018 (O&M)
and connected cases

20

83.	RFA-2356-2018	DALJEET SINGH AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
84.	RFA-4504-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S PUSHPA DEVI AND ORS
85.	RFA-4973-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S GOPI CHAND & ORS
86.	RFA-5199-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S SMT PRITAM KAUR & OTHERS
87.	RFA-3195-2018	ASHOK KUMAR & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
88.	RFA-4668-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA V/S KRISHNAWANTI & ORS
89.	RFA-5192-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S NARGIS & OTHERS
90.	RFA-2358-2018	HARBHAJAN SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
91.	RFA-47-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S GURDAIL SINGH AND ORS
92.	RFA-4658-2018	THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S RAJESH KUMAR & OTHERS
93.	RFA-2641-2018	AJAY PAL SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
94.	RFA-2359-2018	CHAMBA RAM AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
95.	RFA-9208-2018	STATE OF HARYANA V/S BALDEV SINGH AND ORS
96.	RFA-187-2020	VEENA RANI @ VEENA BANSAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
97.	RFA-5190-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S AJAYPAL SINGH & OTHERS
98.	RFA-2350-2018	BALDEV SINGH AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
99.	RFA-4505-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S HARBHAJAN SINGH & OTHERS
100.	RFA-4069-2018	BALDEV SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
101.	RFA-5193-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S SHAM CHAND & ANOTHER
102.	RFA-2692-2018	GURDIAL SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA THRO COLLECTOR AND ORS
103.	RFA-4655-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S DAULAT SINGH & OTHERS
104.	RFA-4971-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S NISHAN SINGH & ORS
105.	RFA-4506-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S NATHA SINGH & OTHERS
106.	RFA-5194-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S AARTI GOYAL & ANOTHER
107.	RFA-48-2019	STATE OF HARYANA V/S SUMITRA DEVI (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS
108.	RFA-3196-2018	SHANTI DEVI V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

109.	RFA-5188-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S RAJ KUMAR & OTHERS
110.	RFA-4978-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANR V/S BALDEV SINGH & ORS
111.	RFA-4559-2018	STATE OF HARYANA & ANOTHER V/S KAUSHLYA DEVI & OTHERS
112.	RFA-9209-2018	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S ARJUN DASS AND ORS
113.	RFA-4230-2019	AARTI GOYAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
114.	XOBJR-2-2019	STAE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS V/S NEERU GARG AND ORS
115.	XOBJR-3-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR V/S PUSHPA DEVI AND OTHERS
116.	RFA-25-2020	ASHWANI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

31.08.2022
rekha

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE