

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RFA-4759 of 2018(O&M)
Date of Order: 17.05.2022

Om Parkash (deceased) through LRs and another

..Petitioners

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(Oral)

1. The landowners by filing appeals under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') pray for the modification of the award dated 03.01.2013 passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the RC') while deciding 144 reference petitions filed under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. The notification under Section 4, 6 and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as 'the LAC') as well as 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 integrated complex for industrial, transport, Section 30-C, Sector 30-D, Sector 31-C and other utilities in village Kheri Sadh, Tehsil & District Rohtak.
2.	Declaration under Section 4 of the 1894 Act	10.01.2011.	
3.	Award No.18, under Section 11 of the 1894 Act.	03.01.2013	Land measuring 2478 kanals 8 marlas
4	Assessment of the market value		Rs.33,00,000/- per acre.
5.	Assessment by the RC	05.07.2018	All the references were dismissed.

3. For the purpose of describing the location and its potential, the pleadings of the landowners in cases arising from village Balyana (which

has been disposed of on 13.05.2022) being identical, 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 situated 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 i.e. The Government Employees Cooperative Housing Society Ltd., Sun City Projects, Omaxe 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-I and II, where many big industrial concerns 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. The 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 the applications made by the landowners, the matter was referred to the RC. 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 for issuance of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894?”*
- (2) Whether the petitioners are entitled to any amount as enhanced compensation, as alleged, if so to what extent?OPP*
- (3) Whether the petitions are not maintainable?OPR*
- (4) Whether the petitioners have got no locus standi to file the present petitions?OPR*

- (5) Whether the petitions are bad for non-joinder of necessary party and mis-joinder of unnecessary party?OPR
- (6) Whether the petitioners have not come to the Court with clean hands and has suppressed the true and material facts from the Court?OPR
- (7) Whether the petitions are barred by limitation, as per the provisions of the Limitation Act, 1963?OPR
- (8) Relief.”

5. **ORAL AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE**

5.1 **ORAL EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE LANDOWNERS**

PW1	Chand Singh
PW2	Silak Ram
PW3	Surender Singh
PW4	Deepak
PW5	Devender

5.2 **ORAL EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE HSIIDC**

RW1/A	Krishan Kumar Patwari of HSIIDC, Rohtak.
-------	--

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

Ex.P6	A copy of the policy prescribing for no litigation incentive and rehabilitation and resettlement policy for outsee landowners dated 09.11.2010.
Ex.P7	Report of the District Horticulture Officer
Ex.P8	Evaluation of fruit trees
Ex.P9	Estimated cost of construction of community water tank

Ex.P10	Sanction of community water tank dated 04.03.2010
Ex.P11	Application for release of sanctioned amount for construction of community water tank
Ex.P18	Award No.44, dated 20.01.2017 passed by the LAC with respect to notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 19.12.2013 proposing to acquire 19 kanals 13 marlas land for expansion of the IMT. Te LAC assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.38,22,356/- per acre.
Ex.P19	Layout plan
Ex.P20	Notice under Section 9 of the 1894 Act
Ex.P21	Notice under The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.
Ex.P22	Jamabandi for the year 2010-2011

5.4**DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY THE HSIIDC (APART FROM THE SALE DEEDS, THE DETAILS WHEREOF ARE GIVEN IN PARA 5.5)**

Ex.R1	Authority letter in favour of Krishan Kumar Patwari
Ex.R8	Minutes of the meeting of Board of Directors of HSIIDC with respect to village and skilled development scheme.
Ex.R9	The same notification as Ex.P6
Ex.R10	Supplementary award no.2dated 12.11.2013 announced by LAC with respect to buildings/structure,/tubewells and trees.
Ex.R11	Minutes of the meeting of the Divisional Level Price Fixation Committee held on 16.11.2012.
Ex.R12	Minutes of the meeting of the Divisional Level Price Fixation Committee held on 28.12.2012.
Ex.R13	A comprehensive layout plan identifying the location of various parcels of land sold through exemplar sale deeds
Ex.R14	The LAC's award no.18 dated 03.1.2013 with respect to acquisition of land in village Kheri Sadh.

5.5 In order to assess the market value of the acquired land on the basis of comparable sale method, the most important evidence is the sale exemplars, if any produced. For the sake of brevity and convenience, it is considered appropriate to compile the information with regard to exemplar sale deeds produced by both the parties 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	1738 30.10.2012	1A	1,68,30,000 1,68,30,000
2.	P-2	1739 30.10.2012	1A	1,68,30,000 1,68,30,000
3.	P-3	1749 31.10.2012	2A	1,68,30,000 3,36,60,000
4.	P-4	1750 31.10.2012	1A	1,68,30,000 1,68,30,000
5.	P-5	1757 02.11.2012	1A-3K-7M	1,68,29,999 2,38,77,562
6.	P-12	1839 27.08.2009	120 Sq. Yards	38,72,000 96,000
7.	P-13	2464 27.11.2009	330 Sq. Yards	38,72,000 2,64,000
8.	P-14	2445 25.11.2009	190 Sq. Yards	38,97,473 1,53,000
9.	P-15	1902 02.09.2009	200 Sq. Yards	38,72,000 1,60,000
10.	P-16	675 15.06.2007	10M	83,36,000 5,21,000
11.	P-17	238 12.05.2006	14M	46,45,714 4,06,500
Sale deeds produced by the State				
12.	R-2	1295 17.11.2008	136.11 Sq. Yards	34,13,709 96,000
13.	R-3	1735 12.08.2009	1A-5K-14M	16,00,000 27,40,000
14.	R-4	1801 21.08.2009	2K-4M	14,54,545 4,00,000
15.	R-5	1804 21.08.2009	4K-2M	13,01,463 6,67,000
16.	R-6	2298 03.11.2009	1A	13,00,000 13,00,000

Sale deeds produced by the landowners				
17.	R-7	2768 11.01.2010	2A-6K-14M	23,66,519 67,15,000

6. ANALYSIS OF THE AWARD

6.1 (a) The RC has observed that exemplar sale deed Ex.R2 to Ex.R7 reflect a price lower than the market value assessed by the LAC, therefore, these cannot be taken into account in view of bar contained in Section 25 of the 1894 Act.

(b) The sale instances Ex.P1 to Ex.P5 are with respect to the period subsequent to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act and hence, it cannot be relied upon the same for the purpose of assessing market value as on 11.01.2010.

(c) The sale instances Ex.P12 to Ex.P17 are with respect to small plots and therefore, not comparable. Further, there location was also not comparable viz-a-viz the acquired land.

(d) The sale instances Ex. P16 and Ex.P17 are also not relevant due to a long time gap between the sale instance and the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act.

(e) The court also observed that the assessment made by the LAC with respect to trees and water tank is correct.

7. ARGUMENTS ADDRESSED BY THE LEARNED COUNSELS

7.1 This Bench has heard the learned counsels for the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the judgment passed by the RC

along with its record which was requisitioned. Shri N.C.Kinra, the learned counsel representing the landowners and Shri Pritam Singh Saini, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC has filed their respective synopsis.

7.2 The learned counsel representing the landowners while referring to the history of acquisition in the area for setting up the various phases of Industrial Model Township contends that the market value of the acquired land had seen a quantum jump after the acquisition for Phase-I and Phase-II on 09.06.2006 and 13.08.2008, respectively. It was submitted that in RFA No.926 of 2017, decided on 01.09.2021, the High Court with respect to the first round of acquisition vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, dated 09.06.2006, of village Kheri Sadh, assessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.28,69,910/- per acre, with respect to the land located upto the depth of 1 acre abutting the National Highway. Whereas with respect to the land beyond the depth of one acre, the market value assessed at the rate of Rs.19,77,000/- was upheld. It has further been brought to the notice of the Court that while deciding the appeals with respect to second phase of acquisitions initiated vide notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 13.02.2008, the High Court on 10.11.2021 in RFA No.1625 of 2016, assessed the market value of the acquired land upto the depth of one acre on the National Highway at the rate of Rs.30,89,066/-, whereas the market value for the land located beyond the depth of one acre was assessed at the rate of Rs.28,08,242/- per acre. He further contends that the RC has wrongly ignored the LAC's Award No.44 dated 20.01.2017, assessing the market value @ Rs.38,22,356/- with respect to the acquisition of land vide notification dated 19.12.2013, under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. It is contended that Sh. Krishan Kumar Patwari has admitted that

the acquired land was already developed. It is also contended that as per no litigation incentive announced by the Government in the Policy dated 09.11.2010, the State has already declared that 20% additional amount shall be given to the owners who do not opt for litigation. The learned counsel claims that the farmers are at least entitled to the aforesaid amount. While referring to sale exemplar Ex.P16, dated 15.06.2007, with respect to 306 sq. yards plot sold at the rate of Rs.83,36,000/-per acre and exemplar sale deed Ex.P17 dated 12.05.2006 with respect to 403 sq. yards land sold at the rate of Rs.4, 66, 45, 714/- per acre, it has been contended that the Court should have relied upon these sale deeds. The learned counsel, while referring to the oral evidence of RW1 Krishan Kumar Patwari, PW1-Chand Singh, PW2-Silk Ram and PW3-Surender Singh, contends that the potential to use the acquired land for commercial purpose is admitted and therefore, the Court should modify the award. Sale instances Ex.P16 and Ex.P17 have been wrongly discarded as the acquired land has an edge over the land which was acquired for Phase-I and Phase-II.

7.4 Per contra, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC while referring to layout plan Ex.R13, contends that the location of the various parcels of land of the sale exemplars produced by the landowners is at a distance from the acquired land, whereas, sale exemplar Ex.R2 is with respect to the acquired land itself.

8. DISCUSSION BY THE COURT

8.1 The RC while ignoring sale deeds Ex.R2 to Ex.R7 has observed that these sale exemplars cannot be taken into consideration because they reflect a price lower than the amount assessed by the LAC. The reasoning is patently erroneous as Section 25 of the 1894 Act does not prohibit the Court

from taking into account the sale exemplar reflecting lower price than the amount assessed by the LAC. This matter is no longer res-integra in view of the judgment passed in *Lal Chand vs. Union of India, (2009) 15 SCC 769*.

8.2 The next reason assigned by the RC is with respect to sale deeds Ex.P1 to Ex.P5 which are subsequent to the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act which being a matter of fact is affirmed by the Bench. Similarly, sale exemplars Ex.P12 to P15 are with respect to smaller plots, therefore, not comparable. No exception to the aforesaid reason can be made out. Further, it has also correctly observed that sale exemplars Ex.P16 and Ex.P17 are not only with respect to the period which is approximately 3 years prior to the notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act but are also with respect to small developed plots, therefore, not found appropriate to be relied upon for assessing the market value of the acquired land.

8.3 On a careful analysis of layout plan Ex.R13, it is evident that the various exemplar sale deeds produced by the landowners cannot be relied upon for the reasons which have been stated by the Reference Court. These sale exemplars are also with respect to parcels of land location whereof is at a long distance from the acquired land.

8.4 With reference to the acquisitions in the village for developing Industrial Model Township on two previous occasions, it may be noticed that the acquired land under those acquisitions though, was situated in the same village, but these parcels of land are different. Due to the existence of the sale exemplars, the assessment made by the Court in the aforesaid previous acquisitions cannot be relied upon. In the present case, the area of acquired land located in village Kheri Sadh is not close to the National

Highway. As on 13.02.2008, the market value of the acquired land was assessed at the rate of Rs.28,08,242/-. The LAC itself has assessed the market value as on 10.01.2010 at the rate of Rs.33,00,000/- per acre. Within a period of less than two years, the market value has been increased by Rs.5,00,000/ per acre approximately. Furthermore, the sale exemplars produced by the landowners do not prove that there was any exponential increase in the price of the land in the village. Vide sale deed Ex.R3, the land measuring 13 kanals and 14 marlas has been sold on 12.08.2009, for Rs.27,40,000/-. The per acre rate comes to Rs.16,00,000/- per acre. This parcel of land is located near the acquired land in village Kheri Sadh itself. Similarly, vide sale deed Ex.R6, dated 03.11.2009, one acre of land has been sold at the rate of Rs.13,00,000/- per acre which is also located close to the acquired land. Even on the date of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act i.e. 11.01.2010, 22 kanals and 14 marlas of land vide Ex.R7 has been sold for Rs.67,15,000/- which comes to Rs.23,61,319/- per acre. Ex.R2 is the exemplar sale deed of the acquired land itself which is considered most appropriate. Although, it is with respect to a small plot, still the per acre price comes to Rs.34,13,710/- (rounded figure).

8.5 As regards the argument of learned counsel making a desperate prayer to the Court to award at least 20% increase as per the policy of the State of Haryana, it may be noticed that this court, while deciding the cases arising from village Balyana in **Yashpal and others vs. State of Haryana and others** (RFA No.3894 of 2017 and other connected cases, decided on 13.05.2022), with respect to same acquisition, has observed as under:-

“The first argument is with respect to the grant of 20% as no

litigation incentive as per the notification dated 09.11.2010. On a careful reading of the aforesaid policy, it is evident that an application under the policy was required to be submitted according to Form-I while giving an undertaking not to file any application under Section 18 of the 1894 Act to the LAC. This policy has been introduced by the State of Haryana in order to promote acquisition of the land for public purpose with consent of the landowners. This policy is not applicable once the landowners have already filed an application under Section 18 of the 1894 Act and have further preferred an appeal before this Court. Hence, the benefit of the aforesaid policy cannot be extended to the appellants since they do not qualify under the conditions laid therein.”

9. **DECISION**

9.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this court does not find any ground to interfere with the assessment of market value arrived at by the RC. Consequently, finding no merit, the appeals are hereby dismissed.

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

May 17, 2022

nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party name
1.	RFA-812-2019	UMED SINGH THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
2.	RFA-13673-2018	RATTAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
3.	RFA-13674-2018	MUKHTIAR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
4.	RFA-2055-2019	SATBIR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
5.	RFA-13668-2018	OM SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
6.	RFA-13687-2018	RAMESH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
7.	RFA-815-2019	UMED SINGH SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
8.	RFA-502-2019	SMT. PATORI THRU LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-39-2019	MUKHTIAR SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
10.	RFA-13686-2018	SHRI BHAGWAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
11.	RFA-501-2019	BIJE SINGH THRU LRS AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
12.	RFA-13671-2018	MUKHTIAR SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
13.	RFA-13660-2018	OMPATI @ OMVATI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
14.	RFA-13684-2018	KAPOOR SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
15.	RFA-13665-2018	OM SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
16.	RFA-13651-2018	SARVAR SINGH SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
17.	RFA-13652-2018	ZILE SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
18.	RFA-13670-2018	BALJEET AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
19.	RFA-13657-2018	SATYAWAN & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

20.	RFA-13680-2018	PAWAN KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
21.	RFA-13661-2018	RAMPHAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
22.	RFA-13672-2018	RAJENDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
23.	RFA-13682-2018	VIJAYPAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
24.	RFA-13659-2018	RAM NARAIN SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
25.	RFA-13683-2018	SMT. JAGWANTI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
26.	RFA-1281-2019	SMT. MALHO DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-13675-2018	UMED SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
28.	RFA-13678-2018	SHRI BHAGWAN AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
29.	RFA-13658-2018	RAMESH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
30.	RFA-498-2019	SMT. BIMLA AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
31.	RFA-13654-2018	RAM KISHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
32.	RFA-13679-2018	KRISHNA AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
33.	RFA-13656-2018	NAFE SINGH SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
34.	RFA-13681-2018	SULTAN SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
35.	RFA-13663-2018	RAMESH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
36.	RFA-13685-2018	BIJENDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
37.	RFA-1283-2019	SMT. MALHO DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
38.	RFA-13676-2018	SATYAWAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

39.	RFA-13669-2018	DAYA RAM SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
40.	RFA-13667-2018	SATYAWAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
41.	RFA-818-2019	HOSHIYAR SINGH THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
42.	RFA-1282-2019	SMT. MAYA DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
43.	RFA-13666-2018	ZORA AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
44.	RFA-13650-2018	RAMESH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
45.	RFA-13677-2018	RANBIR SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
46.	RFA-360-2019	SARVAR SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
47.	RFA-13653-2018	KAPOOR SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
48.	RFA-13630-2018	RANBIR SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
49.	RFA-6333-2018	BIJE SINGH SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
50.	RFA-6337-2018	UMED SINGH DECEASED THR LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
51.	RFA-6334-2018	BIJENDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
52.	RFA-4826-2018	SUKHI RAM ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
53.	RFA-4777-2018	CHANDER BHAN ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
54.	RFA-13623-2018	SOBHA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
55.	RFA-4825-2018	VIDYA ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
56.	RFA-5274-2018	UMED SINGH SINCE DECASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC

57.	RFA-13636-2018	PREET SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
58.	RFA-4770-2018	SURAJ MAL ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
59.	RFA-4822-2018	DHARAMPAL ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
60.	RFA-4771-2018	SURAJ MAL ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
61.	RFA-13646-2018	SMT. OMPATI HOODA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
62.	RFA-4759-2018	OM PARKASH DECEASED THR LRS ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
63.	RFA-13629-2018	JAGDISH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
64.	RFA-4775-2018	DAYA NAND ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
65.	RFA-4764-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
66.	RFA-13634-2018	BALWAN SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
67.	RFA-13628-2018	ISHWAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
68..	RFA-13625-2018	BIJE SINGH SINCE DECEASED THR LR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
69.	RFA-5276-2018	KRISHAN DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
70.	RFA-13639-2018	PATASO AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
71.	RFA-13645-2018	RAMPHAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
72.	RFA-5275-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
73.	RFA-13642-2018	SMT. CHAND KAUR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
74.	RFA-13622-2018	UMED SINGH SINCE DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
75.	RFA-4776-2018	INDERSI THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
76.	RFA-5278-2018	BALWAN SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
77.	RFA-13643-2018	PREET SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

78.	RFA-13627-2018	JAGDISH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
79.	RFA-4774-2018	ASHOK V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
80.	RFA-13565-2018	BHATERI DECEASED THR LRS ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
81.	RFA-13633-2018	SMT. ANITA HOODA V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
82.	RFA-13626-2018	BIJE SINGH SINCE DECEASED THR LR AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
83.	RFA-13640-2018	OM SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
84.	RFA-4823-2018	SUKHI RAM ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
85.	RFA-5273-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
86.	RFA-13632-2018	BALWAN SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
87.	RFA-13624-2018	DHARAMBIR AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
88.	RFA-4828-2018	DHARAMPAL ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
89.	RFA-13638-2018	DHANPATI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
90.	RFA-13635-2018	RAJBIR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
91.	RFA-13648-2018	TARA CHAND THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
92.	RFA-4760-2018	DHARAMPAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
93.	RFA-13641-2018	ZILE SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
94.	RFA-4763-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
95.	RFA-4773-2018	JAI PARKASH ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
96.	RFA-13644-2018	SMT. OMPATI @ OMPATI V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
97.	RFA-4772-2018	SURAJ MAL ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC

98.	RFA-4778-2018	AJIT SINGH ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
99.	RFA-4769-2018	MOHAN DUTT ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
100.	RFA-13631-2018	SMT. PATASO AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
101.	RFA-4761-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
102.	RFA-5271-2018	MAHINDER ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
103.	RFA-5277-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
104.	RFA-13647-2018	OM PARKASH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
105.	RFA-13637-2018	KRISHNA AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
106.	RFA-13649-2018	BIJENDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
107.	RFA-6338-2018	RAM BHAJ DECEASED THR LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
108.	RFA-8426-2018	MUKHTIAR SINGH AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
109.	RFA-5272-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
110.	RFA-4830-2018	DHARAMPAL ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
111.	RFA-4762-2018	RAGHBIR ETC V/S STATE OF HARYANA ETC
112.	RFA-2110-2019	SOMBIR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
113.	RFA-2400-2019	RAJ KANWAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
114.	RFA-2404-2019	SMT. GEENA DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
115.	RFA-2401-2019	RAJBIR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
116.	RFA-2397-2019	RAJ KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
117.	RFA-2111-2019	RISAL SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

118.	RFA-2109-2019	SMT. HUKAM KAUR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
119.	RFA-2112-2019	BHIM SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
120.	RFA-2621-2019	MEWA DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
121.	RFA-2115-2019	RAJENDER AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
122.	RFA-2894-2019	SURENDER AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
123.	RFA-2398-2019	HUKAM SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
124.	RFA-2403-2019	SMT. GEENA DEVI AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
125.	RFA-2053-2019	RANDHIR SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
126.	RFA-2895-2019	SURAJMAL AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
127.	RFA-2114-2019	BHIM SINGH AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
128.	RFA-2421-2019	RAJ KANWAR AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
129.	RFA-2399-2019	SMT. GEENA DEVI AND OTHERS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
130.	RFA-2113-2019	RISAL SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
131.	RFA-2907-2019	AJIT ETC. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
132.	RFA-1-2020	RAM BHAJ (DECEASED) THR LRS. AND ORS. VS. STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE