

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RFA-3149 of 2018(O&M)
Date of Order: 23.05.2022
Reserved Date: 26.04.2022

Jaipal and others

..Appellants

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Sarvesh Malik, Advocate
Mr. N.C. Kinra, Advocate
Mr. N.K. Malhotra, Advocate
Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate
Mr. S.R. Hooda, Advocate
Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate
Mr. Parveen Kaushik, Advocate
Mr. Kamal Mor, Advocate
Mr. S.K. Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate
Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate
Mr. M.S. Rana, Advocate
Mr. Sanjeev K. Aggarwal, Advocate
Mr. Ojas Bansal, Advocate
Mr. Tejas Bansal, Advocate
Mr. Anil Dutt, Advocate for
Mr. S.P. Khatri, Advocate
for the landowners.

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

Mr. P.S. Saini, Advocate
for HSIIDC.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') pray for the modification of the award dated 22.02.2017 passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the RC'). The notification under Section 4, 6 and the awards passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as 'the LAC') as well as by the RC are common. The learned counsels representing the parties are ad-idem that this batch of appeals can be decided by a common judgment.

2. The relevant particulars of the case are as under:-

1.	Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act	11.01.2010	For setting up industrial Model Township, Phase-3, Rohtak, to be planned and developed as integrate complex for industrial, transport, Section 30-C, Sector 30-D, Sector 31-C and other utilities in village Kharawar, Tehsil & District Rohtak.
2.	Declaration under Section 4 of the 1894 Act	10.01.2011.	
3.	Award No.19, under Section 11 of the 1894 Act.	04.01.2013	Land measuring 2332 kanals 3 Marlas
4	Assessment of the market value		Rs.36,89,900/- per acre.
5.	Assessment by the RC	12.04.2018	All the references were dismissed.

3. For the purpose of describing the potential and location of the land, the pleadings of the landowners, with respect to acquired land located in villages Kheri Sadh, Balyana and Kharawar, being common, are extracted as under:-

“The appellants claim that the acquired land is located near National Highway No.10 Rohtak-Delhi Road, Asthal

Bohar and various hotels, banquet halls, Tilyar Lake are adjacent to the acquired land. Various educational institutions, namely, Baba Mast Nath College of Engineering, Eye Hospital, Ayurvedic College, College of Pharmacy, College of Physiotherapy, Shri Baba Mast Nath Residential Public School, Indus Public School, DAV Public School, and DAV Centary Public School, Rohtak, are located nearby. The residential colonies, namely, The Government Employees Cooperative Housing Society Ltd., Sun City Projects and Omex Project, Parsavnath Builder and Sector 27 are also located close by. The acquired land is surrounded by residential colonies and as such the price of the acquired land is not less than Rs. 5 crore per acre. It is also claimed that in village Balyana previously the land has been acquired for setting up Industrial Model Township Phase-1 and II, where various big industrial concern like Asian Paints, Maruti Testing and Research Central, National Highway NO.71-A and Foodwear Institute have come up. The acquired land is situated within the National Capital Region and falls within the limits of Municipal Corporation, Rohtak. Maharishi Dayanand University and Pandit B.D.Sharma PGIMS, Rohtak, are at a short distance and religious places like Hanuman Mandir, Sainath Temple, Radha Soami Trust are situated near the acquired land.”

4. On appreciation of the pleadings, the RC culled out the following issues:-

- “(1) What was the market value of the acquired land at the time of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894?OPP
- (2) Whether the petitioners are entitled to any amount as enhanced compensation as alleged, if so, to what extent?OPP
- (3) Whether the present petitions are not maintainable?OPR
- (4) Whether the petitioners have got no locus standi to file the present petitions?OPR
- (5) Whether the present petition is bad for non-joinder of necessary party and mis-joinder of unnecessary party?OPR
- (6) Whether the petitions are barred by limitation, as per the provisions of the Limitation Act, 1963?OPR
- (7) Relief.”

5. ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

5. ORAL EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE LANDOWNERS

PW1	Neeraj
PW2	Jitender Malik
PW3	Jai Bhagwan, WBM in the office of sub-Registrar, Sampla,
PW4	Yudhvir
PW5	Om Parkash

5.2 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE LANDOWNERS (APART FROM THE SALE DEEDS DETAILS WHEREOF ARE GIVEN IN PARA 5.5)

Ex.	Award No.23, dated 20.12.2013 with respect to acquisition of 13 acres 7 kanals and 16 marla of land in village Kharawar under National Higwhays Act vide prelimianry notification dated 14.12.2011 while assessing the market value of the land @ Rs.66,00,000/- per acres.
Ex.PY	The lay out plan.

5.3

ORAL EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE HSIIDC

On the other hand, the HSIIDC examined

RW1	Krishan Kumar Patwari
-----	-----------------------

5.4

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE HSIIDC APART FROM THE SALE DEEDS DETAILS WHEREOF ARE PROVIDED IN PARA 5.5)

Ex.R1	Resolution authorizing Patwari to appear in evidence
Ex.R6	Policy of the State of Haryana specifying incentive to for no litigation and providing for resettlement and rehabilitation of oustee lanowners
Ex.R7	Supplementary award passed by the LAC on 08.11.2013 while assessing the market value of building/structure/tubewell and trees.
Ex.R8	Resolution of the Board of Directors of the HSIIDC of village and Skill Development.
Ex.R9	Minutes of meeting of Divisional Level Price Fixation Committee dated 16.12.2012.
Ex.R12	Minutes of meeting of Divisional Level Price Fixation Committee held on 28.12.2012.
Ex.R11	Layout plan identifying the location of the various sale exemplar
Ex.R13	RC's award dated 22.02.2017 with respect to acquisition of acquired land in village Balyana vide common notification.

5.5 In order to determine the market value of the acquired land on the basis of comparable sale method, the most important evidence is the sale exemplars produced by the parties. For brevity and convenience, the information of the various sale deeds produced by the respective parties has been compiled in a table which is extracted as under:-

Sale Deeds produced by the landowners				
Sr. No.	Exhibit Nos.	Sale Deed No. & Date	Total Area	Price consideration / Price Per Acre
1.	P-1 P-8	120 16.04.2007	1K-7M	8,06,400 47,78,666
2.	P-2 P-12	441 25.05.2007	32K-5M	1,93,49,760 47,99,940
3.	P-3 P-10	2591 16.12.2009	1A-3K-16M	1,06,20,625 72,00,423
4.	P-4	2052 22.09.2009	1A-3K-4M	49,00,000 35,00,000
5.	P-5	2223 20.10.2009	7K-15M	63,00,000 65,03,225
6.	P-6	3061 22.02.2010	4K-16M	21,00,000 35,00,000
7.	P-7 P-11	1102 19.08.2013	1A-5K-16M	1,20,75,000 70,00,000
8.	P-9	1115 30.08.2010	2K-13M	16,00,000 48,30,188
Sale Deeds produced by the State				
9.	R-2	1474 03.08.2009	1A-4K	18,00,000 17,56,097
10.	R-3	3060 22.02.2010	2A-6K-7M	36,32,000 13,00,044
11.	R-4	201 30.04.2010	1A-7K-4M	30,40,000 16,00,000
12.	R-5	707 30.06.2010	1A	25,00,000 25,00,000

6 ANALYSIS OF THE AWARD PASSED BY RC

6.1 The RC after noticing that the sale exemplars Ex.P1 is same as Ex.P8, Ex.P2 is equivalent to Ex.P12, Ex.P3 is the same as Ex.P10, whereas Ex.P7 is equivalent to Ex.P11, held that Ex.P1 and Ex.P2 are with respect to the period which is much prior to the date of assessment i.e. 10.01.2010 and therefore, cannot be made basis to assess the market value of the acquired land. Thereafter, the court noticed that sale exemplars Ex.P6, Ex.P7 and Ex.P9 are subsequent to the date of assessment i.e. 10.01.2010 and hence, not found reliable for assessing the market value. Thereafter, the Court proceeded to calculate the average price per acre of sale exemplar Ex.P3, P4

and P5 and arrived at a figure of Rs.56,76,910/-. The Court after taking into consideration that these sale instances are relating to the small parcels of land, applied deduction of 35% and consequently, arrived at a figure of Rs.36,89,900/- per acre. The sale exemplars Ex.R2 to Ex.R5 produced by the HSIIDC were ignored on the ground that these are reflecting lesser value than the amount assessed by the LAC therefore, cannot be taken into account in view of the bar contained in Section 25 of the 1894 Act. The Court also refused to rely upon the judgment Ex.R13 passed with respect to village Balyana as the location of the acquired land in both villages is different.

7. **ARGUMENTS ADDRESSED BY THE LEARNED COUNSELS FOR BOTH THE PARTIES**

7.1 This Bench has heard the learned counsels for the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the file along with its record which was requisitioned.

7.2 The learned counsel representing the landowners while drawing the attention of the Court to the judgment passed in RFA NO.3447 of 2019 (Haryana State Industrial Infrastructure Development Corporation and another vs. Raj Singh and others) decided on 29.10.2019 contends that the various appeals filed by the HSIIDC out of the same acquisition challenging the common award passed by the RC on 12.04.2018 have already been dismissed. They further contend that the award passed by the RC is liable to be modified as the court has erred in taking out the average price reflected in these sale deeds and thereafter, applying deduction at the rate of 35%. They contend that the sale exemplars Ex.P3, Ex.P4 and Ex.P5 are comparable sale instances and therefore, the landowners are entitled to

enhancement.

7.3 Per contra, the learned counsel for the HSIIDC has contended that the RC has committed an error while ignoring sale exemplar Ex.R2 to Ex.R5. He further contends that the reliance placed by the RC on Ex.P3 is wrong because it is with respect to a constructed building along with the land. While referring to the layout plan Ex.R11, the learned counsel contends that the sale exemplars Ex.R3, Ex.R4 and Ex.P6 are with respect to the acquired land, whereas the sale exemplar Ex.P4 is located on the National Highway and Ex.P5 represents parcels of land located at a distance. Hence, he contends that no modification is required.

8. DISUCSSION BY THE COURT

On a careful analysis of the exemplar sale deeds, it is evident that sale exemplar Ex.P1, Ex.P8 and Ex.P2, Ex.P12 are with respect to the parcels of land purchased for constructing Radha Soami Satsang Ghar (Religious place for congregation). These parcels of land are located on the Rohtak-Delhi Road National Highway. Ex.P3 is with respect to a constructed building of a factory. In the sale deed, it is specifically recorded that the land along with a building is being sold. Ex.P4 is a sale deed through which a trust purchased the property which is located on the National Highway. This parcel of land is also abutting the acquired land. Ex.P5 is a sale instance with respect to land which appears to be located at a distance because the acquired land is comprised in Rect. No.7, 8, 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 44, 45,47,48, 61, 62, whereas the land in sale instance Ex.P5 is comprised in Rect. No.1. Ex.P6 is a sale instance of 4 kanals and 16 marlas of plot purchased by a Mayana Educational Society. This sale deed is from land comprised in Rect. No.62 which is near the acquired land. However,

from the perusal of the layout plan, it is evident that this parcel of land is located on the National Highway. Ex.P7 which is equivalent to Ex.P11 is again with regard to the sale of a building. Location of Ex.P9 is at a distance from the acquired land. On the other hand, sale instance Ex.R4 and Ex.R5 are with respect to the acquired land. From the aforesaid discussion, it is evident that the land located on the National Highway appears to be comparatively higher priced as compared to the land in the interiors on away from the National Highway. From sale deeds Ex.P1, Ex.P2, Ex.P4 and Ex.P62, it is evident that the sale price of the land on the National Highway is higher. If we work out the sale price of the land on the basis of Ex.P6 which has been purchased by Mayana Educational Society, it would come to Rs.35,00,000/- per acre. On the other hand, if we rely upon Ex.P2 which is sale instance of more than 4 acres of land, the per acre price of the land comes to Rs.47,99,941/-. Through sale deed Ex.P2, a parcel of land upto the depth of 2½ acre from the National Highway has been purchased. This sale instance is of approximately 2½ years before the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. However, the parcel of land is purchased for religious congregation and has a good connectivity. There is a curve on the National Highway and the land is located in the corner of the curve.

8.2 Now let's examine the arguments of the learned counsel representing the parties. The first argument is with regard to the development cut of 35%. In **Jai Singh vs.State of Haryana and others (RFA No.3000 of 2021)**, the Court, after discussing the various judgments of the Court, has held that if a comparable sale instance has been produced with respect to the contemporaneous period, the development cut should not be applied. However, in the present case, the sale deeds of the land located

on the National Highway are scanty. The location of the parcels of land sold through the sale deeds Ex.P1, Ex.P2 and Ex.P4 is on the National Highway. The sale instance Ex.P6 also appears to be located on the National Highway. The land in sale deed Ex.P6 as well as Ex.R3 has been purchased by the same Society. The Society while purchasing land measuring 22 kanals and 7 marlas comprised in Rect. No.62, Khasra No.5/1 and 5/2, Rect. No.46, Khasra No.25 and Rect. No.47, Khasra No.21/1/ and 21/2 has paid Rs.36,32,000/- which works out to Rs.13,45,000/- per acre.

9. **DISCUSSION**

9.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, while relying upon the sale instance Ex.P12, some kind of development cut is required to be applied because the land purchased for religious congregation has to be of prime are and not only agricultural land. Accordingly, after applying cut at the rate of 20%, the market value of the land upto the depth of 2 acres on the National Highway is re-assessed @ Rs.38,40,000/- per acre (rounded figure). Whereas, with respect to the remaining land which is beyond the depth of 2 acres, the award passed by the RC is maintained, particularly when the appeals filed by HSIIDC have already been dismissed vide judgment in RFA No.3447 of 2019, decided on 29.10.2019 (**HSIIDC vs. Raj Singh and Others**).

9.2 With these modifications, the judgment of the RC is upheld.

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

23rd May, 2022

nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party Name
1.	RFA-324-2022	SH. RANBIR SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-366-2022	PARAS RAM (SINCE DECEASED) AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
3.	RFA-476-2022	NAURANG AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
4.	RFA-321-2022	ATTAR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-356-2022	NAURANG AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
6.	RFA-371-2022	SAT NARYAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
7.	RFA-352-2022	ROHTASH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-326-2022	BHIM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-357-2022	SURESH CHANDER AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
10..	RFA-316-2022	DILBAG SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
11.	RFA-370-2022	NAURANG AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-360-2022	DALBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
13.	RFA-367-2022	DHARAMBIR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
14.	RFA-317-2022	KARAN SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
15.	RFA-318-2022	ATTAR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
16.	RFA-325-2022	KIRSHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

17.	RFA-359-2022	SMT. ROSHANI @ ROSNI DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-373-2022	UMED SINGH @ UMED MALIK AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
19.	RFA-353-2022	INDRAWATI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
20.	RFA-354-2022	SARJEET @SURJEET SINGH GAUTAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
21.	RFA-3670-2018	SAMUNDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
22.	RFA-3482-2018	BALWAN SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
23.	RFA-3867-2018	RAJMAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
24.	RFA-3488-2018	SHRI BHAGWAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
25.	RFA-3863-2018	NARENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
26.	RFA-3861-2018	SAROJ AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
27.	RFA-3485-2018	KHUSHIYA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
28.	RFA-3368-2018	DHARAMPAL (DECEASED) THR LRS. AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
29.	RFA-3866-2018	DR. SUNIL KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
30.	RFA-3667-2018	BALBIR SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
31.	RFA-3668-2018	BALBIR SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
32.	RFA-3490-2018	SHAMBU (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
33.	RFA-3491-2018	BALJEET SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

34.	RFA-3669-2018	AJIT SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
35.	RFA-3487-2018	KHUSHIYA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
36.	RFA-3493-2018	PARVESH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
37.	RFA-3644-2018	SMT. PARKASHWANTI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
38.	RFA-3489-2018	SHRI KISHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
39.	RFA-3864-2018	SHRI KISHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
40.	RFA-3862-2018	CHALTI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
41.	RFA-3666-2018	MAUJI RAM (DECEASED) THR HIS LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
42.	RFA-3492-2018	DEEPAK AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
43.	RFA-3486-2018	RAM KANWAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
44.	RFA-3483-2018	ANTRAM AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
45.	RFA-3869-2018	BALJEET SINGH AND ORS1 V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
46.	RFA-3665-2018	KRISHAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
47.	RFA-3484-2018	NAND KISHOR AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
48.	RFA-3868-2018	RAMPHAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
49.	RFA-3672-2018	JANTA DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
50.	RFA-3865-2018	RAM KANWAR(DECEASED) THR LR'S AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
51.	RFA-3860-2018	AZAD SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

52.	RFA-3671-2018	KULDEEP SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
53.	RFA-3155-2018	RAJBALA AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
54.	RFA-3150-2018	PARKASHI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
55.	RFA-3153-2018	PHULO AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
56.	RFA-3149-2018	JAIPAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
57.	RFA-3152-2018	BISHAN PARKASH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
58.	RFA-3156-2018	SAMUNDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
59.	RFA-3154-2018	RAM DHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
60.	RFA-3151-2018	KULDEEP AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
61.	RFA-4261-2018	JITENDER MALIK AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
62.	RFA-3929-2018	LAKHMI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
63.	RFA-2015-2019	DALBIR SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
64.	RFA-3989-2018	SHILAK RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
65.	RFA-4236-2018	BHAN SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
66.	RFA-4231-2018	RAM NIWAS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
67.	RFA-3987-2018	SATPAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
68.	RFA-5220-2018	SANTOSH DEVI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
69.	RFA-3997-2018	BALJEET SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
70.	RFA-3991-2018	ANTRAM AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

71.	RFA-4258-2018	RAMESH (DECEASED) THRU LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
72.	RFA-4234-2018	RAM KARAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
73.	RFA-3871-2018	BALWAN SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
74.	RFA-4228-2018	MANJEET AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
75.	RFA-3992-2018	RAJBALA AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
76.	RFA-4233-2018	SMT. SABHO AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
77.	RFA-8395-2018	DALBIR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
78.	RFA-5047-2018	YUDHVIR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
79.	RFA-5133-2018	CHHOTE LAL(DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
80.	RFA-4719-2018	RAM SINGH AND ORS. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
81.	RFA-3986-2018	INDERJEET AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
82.	RFA-4720-2018	SUKHBIR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
83.	RFA-3911-2018	DHARAMBIR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.
84.	RFA-4230-2018	OMPARKASH @ PARKASH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
85.	RFA-4235-2018	SURESH CHANDER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
86.	RFA-4232-2018	NARENDER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
87.	RFA-4260-2018	JAGBIR (DECEASED) THRU LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

88.	RFA-3912-2018	CHHOTE LAL(DECEASED) THR HIS LRS AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
89.	RFA-4227-2018	SATYA AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
90.	RFA-4237-2018	NIWAS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
91.	RFA-3988-2018	BALWAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
92.	RFA-3870-2018	RAJ SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
93.	RFA-4229-2018	RAM KANWAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
94.	RFA-3993-2018	BALJEET SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
95.	RFA-4718-2018	RAM NIWAS DECEASED AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
96.	RFA-3984-2018	RAGHBIR SINGH (DECEASED) THR HIS LR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
97.	RFA-8396-2018	NARENDER AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
98.	RFA-3990-2018	BALJEET SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
99.	RFA-87-2020	BHARTO DEVI (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
100.	RFA-172-2020	NAVEEN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
101.	RFA-243-2020	SUKHBIR MALIK AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
102.	RFA-242-2020	RAM KISHAN AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
103.	RFA-90-2020	RAJINDER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
104.	RFA-190-2020	BHAWANI SHANKAR SHARMA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

105.	RFA-89-2020	DR. OM PARKASH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
106.	RFA-2372-2019	RAM KISHAN AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
107.	RFA-192-2020	PIRTHI SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
108.	RFA-189-2020	RAJBIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
109.	RFA-4260-2019	MAHENDER SINGH THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
110.	RFA-245-2020	RAM KISHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
111.	RFA-244-2020	RAM KISHAN AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
112.	RFA-78-2020	DR. OM PARKASH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
113.	RFA-79-2020	BHARTO DEVI (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
114.	RFA-188-2020	SMT. PARKASH DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
115.	RFA-241-2022	SMT. KITABO DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
116.	RFA-238-2022	SMT. DHAMMAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
117.	RFA-220-2022	CHAND SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
118.	RFA-222-2022	SMT. JASWANTI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
119.	RFA-223-2022	ZILE SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
120..	RFA-219-2022	RAM CHANDER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
121.	RFA-237-2022	SURESH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
122.	RFA-234-2022	INDERJIT SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

123.	RFA-235-2022	SAT NARAIN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
124.	RFA-221-2022	RAJ SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
125.	RFA-239-2022	SURESH CHANDER AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
126..	RFA-626-2022	RAJ SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
127..	RFA-627-2022	RAJ SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
128..	RFA-569-2022	MAHABIR (NOW DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
129..	RFA-570-2022	MAHABIR (NOW DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE