

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

**Regular First Appeal No. 149 of 2022 (O&M)
And Other Connected Cases**

**Date of Decision: 09.01.2023
Reserved On: 21.12.2022**

Siri Pal

... Appellant(s)

Versus

The State of Haryana and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Amit Jain, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Dhruv Mittal, Advocate,
Mr. Pawan Kumar, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Surya Kumar, Mr. Ranvijay Singh Yadav,
Mr. Dharamvir Sharma, Mr. Ashwani Gaur,
Mr. Deepkaran Dalal, Advocates and
Mr. O.P.Goyal, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Parul Aggarwal, Advocate, for the landowners.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for the HSIIDC.

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 While praying for the modification of the market value of the acquired land assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as “the LAC”) which has been affirmed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as “the RC”), the landowners have filed this batch of appeals (details whereof are at the foot of the judgment).

1.2 The notifications under Section 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition

Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as “the 1894 Act”) and the awards passed by the LAC as well as the RC are common. In fact, the RC has consolidated all the 48 petitions in the *LAC Case No. 93 dated 28.08.2015 titled as “Siri Pal v. The State of Haryana and Others”*. The entire evidence was led in the aforesaid case. The learned counsel representing the parties are also *ad idem* that this batch of appeals can conveniently be decided by a common judgment.

1.3 The relevant particulars, for the purpose of decision of the present case, are as under:-

S.NO.	TITLE	DETAILS
1.	Date of Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act.	05.02.2010
2.	Date of Notification under Section 6 of the 1894 Act.	11.02.2011
3.	Purpose of Acquisition.	For the construction of Integrated Complex for Industrial Storage Space, Railway Siding, Institutional public-semi public use and other public utilities.
4.	Location, area and nature of the acquired land	The acquired land is located in village Patli Hazipur, Tehsil Farrukh Nagar, District Gurugram.
5.	Number and Date of the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector.	Vide Award No. 25 dated 08.02.2013 the acquired land measuring 239 acres and 13 marlas, located in Patli Hazipur, Tehsil Farrukh Nagar, District Gurugram.
6.	Amount assessed by the Land Acquisition Collector.	The LAC has offered to pay the market value of the acquired land located in village Patli Hazipur, Tehsil Farrukh Nagar, District Gurugram., @ ₹55,00,000/- per acre.
7.	Date of the judgment of the Reference Court.	25.10.2021
8.	Amount determined by the Reference Court.	The RC has dismissed all the 48 reference petitions.

2. Facts

2.1 Dissatisfied with the amount offered by the LAC, for involuntary acquisition of their land located in village Patli Hazipur, comprised in rectangle No. 40, 41, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151 and 153, on the application of the landowners the cases were referred to the RC under Section 18 of the 1894 Act for redetermination. The landowners have claimed that the market value of the acquired land on 05.10.2010 was not less than ₹5,00,00,000/- as the land has the potential to be utilized for residential, industrial and commercial purposes. It has been asserted that the various five star hotels, commercial sites, residential sectors of the Industrial Model Township, Manesar and many branches of the nationalized banks are located in the said area. On the other hand, the Haryana State Industrial Infrastructure and Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as “the HSIIDC”) has stated that the LAC has already awarded the reasonable, appropriate and adequate market value of the acquired land, therefore, there is no scope for further enhancement.

2.2 It would be noted here that in Regular First Appeal No. 752 of 2022, the landowners have filed an application under Order XLI Rule 27 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (hereinafter referred to as “CPC”) for permitting them to lead additional evidence. The landowners wish to produce the Collector’s rate of the year 2010-11 with respect to the villages located in Tehsil Farrukh Nagar, District Gurugram w.e.f. 11.10.2010. They also wish to produce the Collector’s rates list for the year 2011-12 w.e.f. 01.04.2011 as well as for the year 2012-13 w.e.f. 01.04.2012, a certified

copy of the judgment passed by the RC on 15.03.2022 while deciding the cases of village Dhana with respect to the same notifications, a certified copy of the award No. 26 dated 08.02.2013 with respect to the village Bawra Bakipur and award No. 27 dated 08.02.2013 with respect to the acquisition of the land in village Dhana and award No. 25 dated 08.02.2013 with respect to the village Patli Hazipur. All these documents are the official documents prepared by the Government of Haryana as well as the judgment of the Reference Court. Hence, the application for permission to lead additional evidence is allowed. The same are taken on record as Ex.HC1, Ex.HC2, Ex.HC3, Ex.HC4, Ex.HC5, Ex.HC6 and Ex.HC7, respectively.

2.3 From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by the RC for adjudication:-

- “1) What was the market value of the acquired land at the time of acquisition vide notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 ? OPP
- 2) Whether the petitions are time barred ? OPR
- 3) Relief.”

3. **Evidence Produced by the Respective Parties**

3.1 In the oral evidence, the landowners have examined the following witnesses:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Witness	Particulars of the Witness
1.	PW.1 Sh.Kuldeep	Assistant Draftsman, Office of DTP, Gurugram.
2.	PW.2 Sh. Babu Lal	Petitioner .
3.	PW.3 Sh.Krishan Kumar	Halqa Patwari, Village Patli Hazipur, District Gurugram.
4.	PW.4 Sh.Kanshi Ram Dahiya	Draftsman, District Court, Gurugram.

5.	PW.5 Sh.DevenderSingh	Registration Clerk, Tehsil Farukh Nagar.
6.	PW.6 Sh. Harish Sharma	Petitioner.
7.	PW.7 Sh. Amit Thakran	Petitioner.

3.2 In the documentary evidence, the landowners have produced the following documents, apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation whereof is incorporated in para 5.3 of the judgment:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Ex.P1	Gurugram Manesar Urban Complex Final Development Plan 2021 AD.
2.	Ex.P2	Gurugram Manesar Urban Complex Final development plan 2025 AD
3.	Ex.PX	Original RTI reply dated 9.3.2021 alongwith RTI application
4.	Ex.PY	Original RTI reply dated 7.4.2021 alongwith RTI application
5.	Ex.PA	Certified true copy of the resolution passed by the Board of Directors of the company on 10.2.2017 of M/s. Umang Leasing and Credit Company Limited.
6.	Ex.PAA	Copy of writ petition no. 4952 of 2012 titled as Ms. Umang Leasing and Credit Company Limited Vs. State of Haryana and others, decided on 21.1.2017 by Hon’ble Punjab and Haryana High Court

3.3 On the other hand, in the oral evidence, the HSIIDC has examined Sh.Dalbir Singh Bhatti, Senior Manager (IA), HSIIDC, IMT Manesar, Gurugam as RW.1.

3.4 In the documentary evidence, the HSIIDC has produced the following documents, apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation whereof is in para 5.3 of the judgment:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
1.	Ex.R1	Copy of LAC award no.25 dated 8.2.2013 of Village Patli Hazipur, Tehsil Farrukh Nagar, Distt. District Gurugram.
2.	Ex.R2	Copy of Policy for Rehabilitation and

Sr. No.	Exhibit Number	Description of the document
		resettlement of land owners
3.	Ex.R3	Proceedings of rate fixation committee
4.	Mark A	Collector rate of Tehsil Farrukh Nagar, Gurugram of the year 2009-2010

4. Analysis of the Reasons Recorded by the RC

4.1 After discussing the various sale deeds produced by the landowners, the RC found that the sale deeds bearing Nos. 549 (Ex.P1), 2147 (Ex.P2:Ex.P6), 3475 (Ex.P3), 171 (Ex.P5:Ex.P7), 1542 (Ex.PW.5/A), 2737 (Ex.P9) and 1911 (Ex.P11) are with respect to the constructed buildings/structures like the tube-well, trees etc. and hence, in the absence of the evidence to separately identify the value of the structures/building/trees, it would not be safe to rely upon the aforesaid sale deeds to assess the market value of the acquired land. The sale deed No.1911 (Ex.PW.5/B) pertaining to a plot measuring 200 square yards is also with respect to a house of four rooms. Similarly, the sale deed No. 1697 (Ex.P12) is with respect to a tiny size of plot measuring 250 square yards. Similarly, the sale deed No. 3325 (Ex.P8) pertains to a plot measuring 480 square yards located in village Judola. These sale deeds were also excluded as the parcels of plots sold through the aforesaid sale deeds were not found comparable with the acquired land. The RC held that the sale deed No. 735 dated 28.05.2007 (Ex.P8) with respect to the land measuring 15 kanals and 3 marlas located in village Judola also cannot be relied upon as the land was purchased by bigger corporate entity like M/s Adani Limited. Similarly, the sale deed No. 257 dated 20.04.2007 (Ex.P9) was also not relied upon by the RC. The sale deeds bearing No. 885 (Ex.P13), 908 (Ex.P14), 2852 (Ex.P15) and 2900 (Ex.P16) were with respect to the period post 05.02.2010

i.e. the date of the issuance of preliminary notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, hence, they cannot be relied. Thereafter, the RC has discussed the sale deeds bearing No. 2282 (Ex.R4), 3193 (Ex.R5), 194 (Ex.R6), 2312 (Ex.R7), 3579 (Ex.R8), 1139 (Ex.R9) 2121 (Ex.R10), 2586 (Ex.R11), 2574 (Ex.R12), 3236 (Ex.R13), 3569 (Ex.R14), 1032 (Ex.R15), 1720 (Ex.R16), 1787 (Ex.R17), 2107 (Ex.R18), 3530 (Ex.R19), 2708 (Ex.R20), 2787 (Ex.R21), 2546 (Ex.R22), 2485 (Ex.R23) and 2599)(Ex.R24) produced by the HSIIDC to conclude that there is no cogent evidence to prove that the market value of the acquired land was more than ₹55,00,000/- per acre.

5. Discussion and Analysis of the arguments of the learned counsel representing the parties.

5.1 Heard the learned counsel representing the parties, at length and with their able assistance, perused the impugned judgments as well as the record of the Reference Court, which was requisitioned.

5.2 The learned counsel representing the parties have also filed short notes of their respective arguments.

5.3 At this stage, it would be appropriate to compile the tabulated information of the various sale deeds produced by the respective parties:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Sale Deed No.	Dated	Area	Amount (In ₹)	Name of Village	Rate Per acre (In ₹)
1.	P1	549	08.06.2009	94K-14M	9,65,00,000	Patli Hazipur	81,52,059
2.	P2/P6	2147	13.10.2008	17K-12M	4,01,40,000	Bawra Bakipur	1,82,45,455
3.	P4	2755	17.12.2008	11K-18M	2,82,62,500	Bawra Bakipur	1,90,00,000
4.	P4/P3	3475	16.03.2009	11K-18M	2,35,00,000	Bawra Bakipur	1,57,98,319
5.	P5/P7	171	30.04.2009	18K-16M	4,70,00,000	Bawra Bakipur	2,00,00,000
6.	P5	1710	29.08.2008	17K-16M	3,85,55,957	Bawra Bakipur	1,73,28,520
7.	PW.5/A	1542	15.09.2009	9K-13M	3,79,96,875	Jadola	3,15,00,000

Sr. No.	Exhibit No.	Sale Deed No.	Dated	Area	Amount (In ₹)	Name of Village	Rate Per acre (In ₹)
8.	PW.5/B	1911	09.11.2009	6.5M	5,00,000	Patli Hazipur	1,23,07,692
9.	P6	1709	29.08.2008	23K-15M	5,14,44,043	Bawra Bakipur	1,73,28,520
10.	P7/P9	2737	28.01.2010	9K-12M	5,00,00,000	Jadola	4,16,66,667
11.	P8	3325	04.12.2012	16M	1,05,16,000	Jadola	10,51,60,000
12.	P8	735	28.05.2007	15K-3M	3,21,93,750	Jadola	1,70,00,000
13.	P9	257	20.04.2007	18K-9M	3,45,93,750	Jadola	1,50,00,000
14.	P10/ P14	908	25.06.2010	16K	1,90,00,000	Patli Hazipur	95,00,000
15.	P11	345	25.05.2009	24K-1M	2,70,00,000	Patli Hazipur	89,81,289
16.	P12	1697	09.10.2009	8.5M	5,05,000	Patli Hazipur	95,05,882
17.	P13	885	23.06.2010	12K-	1,42,50,000	Patli Hazipur	95,00,000
18.	P15	2852	04.01.2011	8K-1M	98,00,000	Patli Hazipur	97,39,130
19.	P16	2900	07.01.2011	31K-4M	3,90,00,000	Patli Hazipur	1,00,00,000
20.	R4	2282	18.11.2010	16K	92,00,000	Patli Hazipur	46,00,000
21.	R5	3193	05.10.2011	2K	12,50,000	Patli Hazipur	50,00,000
22.	R6	194	05.05.2009	7K-18M	39,50,000	Patli Hazipur	40,00,000
23.	R7	2312	05.08.2011	4K	25,00,000	Patli Hazipur	50,00,000
24.	R8	3579	31.03.2009	3K-13M	15,97,000	Patli Hazipur	35,00,274
25.	R9	1139	30.07.2009	12K-14M	61,12,000	Patli Hazipur	38,50,079
26.	R10	2121	29.10.2010	4K	23,00,000	Patli Hazipur	46,00,000
27.	R11	2586	11.01.2010	15K-12M	84,00,000	Patli Hazipur	43,07,692
28.	R12	2574	11.01.2010	1K	4,82,000	Patli Hazipur	38,56,000
29.	R13	3236	04.02.2011	2K	11,25,000	Patli Hazipur	45,00,000
30.	R14	3569	09.03.2011	15K-12M	87,75,000	Patli Hazipur	45,00,000
31.	R15	1032	12.07.2010	6K-17M	40,00,000	Patli Hazipur	46,71,533
32.	R16	1720	14.10.2009	1K-2M	5,77,500	Patli Hazipur	42,00,000
33.	R17	1787	27.10.2009	3K-3M	15,16,000	Patli Hazipur	38,50,159
34.	R18	2107	25.11.2009	6K-19M	33,68,750	Patli Hazipur	38.77.698
35.	R19	3530	03.11.2011	2K	12,50,000	Patli Hazipur	50,00,000
36.	R20	2708	25.01.2010	15K-12M	75,07,500	Patli Hazipur	38,50,000
37.	R21	2787	02.09.2011	3K-10M	21,87,500	Patli Hazipur	50,00,000
38.	R22	2546	07.01.2010	4K-12M	22,14,000	Patli Hazipur	38,50,435
39.	R23	2485	08.12.2010	16K-6M	90,84,000	Patli Hazipur	44,58,405
40.	R24	2599	13.01.2010	7K-15M	37,30,000	Patli Hazipur	38,50,323

5.4 From the careful study of the copies of the sale deeds produced by the parties, efforts have been made to identify the location of the acquired land while referring to the rectangle number and khasra numbers of the land located in the village Patli Hazipur.

5.5 A careful study of the requisitioned record, it is evident that the landowners have produced the various layout plans. The layout plan (Ex.P1) is a final development plan for the controlled area of the Gurugram-Manesar Urban Complex 2021 AD whereas the layout plan (Ex.P3) is prepared by the Haryana Government notifying the final development plan for the controlled area of Gurugram-Manesar Urban Complex 2031 AD. Apart from the aforesaid, the landowners have also produced a layout plan of the land located in the villages, namely Dhana, Bawra Bakipur, Patli and Jhorola. On a careful perusal thereof, it is evident that the acquired land in village Patli Hazipur is located towards the Southern side of the railway track which goes from Rewari to Delhi. In fact, the acquired land of village Patli Hazipur is located in South-West corner of the area of village Patli Hazipur. From the careful study of the sale deeds produced by the landowners, it is evident that the landowners have produced the sale deeds bearing No. 549 (Ex.P1), 1911 (Ex.P5/B), 908 (Ex.P10), 345 (Ex.P11), 1697 (Ex.P12), 885 (Ex.P13), 2852 (Ex.P15) and 2900 (Ex.P16) with respect to the land located in village Patli Hazipur. The sale deeds (Ex.P13, Ex.P15 and Ex.P16) are with respect to the period post 05.02.2010, i.e. the date of preliminary notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. The sale deed (Ex.P1) pertains to the land comprised to rectangle No. 91 and 98 location whereof is not reflected in the layout plan (Ex.P10). There is no evidence to prove that the aforesaid parcel of land represented by sale deed bearing No. 549 (Ex.P1) is comparable with the acquired land. The land comprised in rectangle No. 91 and 98 is likely to be located at a sufficient distance from the acquired land. The sale deed (Ex.P5/B) is with respect to a tiny sized plot. Similar is the position of the

sale deed (Ex.P12). The sale deed (Ex.P11) is with respect to the land comprised in rectangle No. 89 and 91. Whereas the sale deed (Ex.P10) pertains to rectangle No. 97. On perusal of the award, it is evident that the land has been acquired out of the rectangle No. 40, 41, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151 and 153. No effort has been made by the landowners to prove that the aforesaid parcels of land (Ex.P1, Ex.P10, Ex.P11) are with respect to the contemporaneous period and are comparable parcels of land with the acquired land.

5.6 The learned counsel representing the landowners have relied upon the sale deeds bearing No. 2147, 3475 and 171 to contend that these sale deeds are of the comparable parcels of land. From the careful perusal of the sale deed (Ex.P10), it is evident that the aforementioned sale deeds are with respect to the village Bawra Bakipur and the parcel of the land sold is located either on the passage or on the Pataudi-Gurugram Road. This piece of land is also at a distance of at least 10 acres away from the acquired land. In the absence of the evidence to prove that the aforesaid sale deeds represent the comparable parcels of land, it would not be appropriate to rely upon the same. The learned counsels representing the landowners have also relied upon the sale deed bearing No. 735, 2737 and 257. These three sale deeds pertain to the various parcels of land located in village Jadola. These parcels of land are located near the railway line, however, at a significant distance from the acquired land. In the absence of evidence of comparable parcels of land, it would not be safe to rely upon the aforesaid sale deeds.

5.7 On the other hand, the HSIIDC has produced the various sale deeds of the land located in village Patli Hazipur which show that the price

of the land at the relevant time was not beyond ₹50,00,000/- per acre. In fact, sale deed bearing No. 1787 (Ex.R17) is with respect to the land comprised in rectangle No. 118 and khasra No. 21 and 22 and rectangle No. 119 and khasra No. 1/12, 2, 3 and 9/1. A careful perusal of the layout plan (Ex.P10) shows that the land comprised in rectangle No.118 abuts the acquired land comprised in rectangle No. 41. The rectangle No.118 is located towards the Eastern side of the rectangle No. 41. Thus, it is obvious that the sale deed (Ex.R17) is with respect to the parcel of land located nearby to the acquired land. Similarly, the sale deed bearing No. 3579 (Ex.R8) pertains to the land comprised in rectangle No. 133. Whereas the acquired land is out of the rectangle No. 136, 137 and 138. Hence, the parcel of land sold through the sale deed (Ex.R8) was also located nearby the acquired land. In view of the aforesaid sale deeds (Ex.R8 and Ex.R17), it would not be safe to rely upon the sale instances produced by the landowners which are either of the land located at a distance or in the different villages. The learned senior counsel has submitted that the Court should rely upon the sale deed bearing No. 1542, 1911, 345 and 1697. The sale deeds bearing No. 1911 and 1697 are with respect to the tiny sized plots. Whereas there is no evidence that the sale deeds bearing No. 1542 and 345 are with respect to comparable parcels of land with the acquired land. Similarly, the learned senior counsel representing the landowners has also relied upon the sale deeds bearing No. 171, 3475, 2755 and 1710. All these sale instances have already been discussed by the Court. The learned senior counsel further submits that the Collector's rate in village Judola was less

Hazipur. In the considered view of this Court, the aforesaid argument cannot be made a basis to assess the market value of the acquired land.

5.8 The learned counsel representing the landowners also relies upon the information received under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (Ex.PX) to the effect that 140 acres of plain agricultural land has been sold to M/s Instacart Services Private Limited @ ₹3,22,00,000/- per acre and while the HSIIDC has spent only ₹2,46,00,000/- on its development. At this stage, it becomes incumbent to carefully examine the information received under the 2005 Act. It is evident that the HSIIDC published an e-auction brochure for the warehousing sites in village Patli Hazipur. The e-auction by way of bidding was to take place on 26.03.2021. In the aforesaid auction, a single bid has been received with respect to the land measuring 140 acres from the company M/s Instacart Services Private Limited @ ₹3,22,00,000/- per acre. The argument of the learned counsel appears to be attractive in the first blush, however, is found without substance on a deeper scrutiny. Section 24 of the 1894 Act specifically debars the Court from taking into consideration any increase to the value of the land acquired which is likely to accrue from the use to which it will be put when acquired. Section 24 of the 1894 Act is extracted as under:-

“24. Matters to be neglected in determining compensation. -

But the Court shall not take into consideration -

first, the degree of urgency which has led to the acquisition;

secondly, any disinclination of the person interested to part with the land acquired;

thirdly, any damage sustained by him which, if caused by a

private person, would not render such person liable to a suit;

fourthly, any damage which is likely to be caused to the land acquired, after the date of the publication of the declaration under section 6, by or in consequence of the use to which it will be put;

fifthly, any increase to the value of the land acquired likely to accrue from the use to which it will be put when acquired;

sixthly, any increase to the value of the other land of the person interested likely to accrue from the use to which the land acquired will be put;

seventhly, any outlay or improvements on, or disposal of the land acquired, commenced, made or effected without the sanction of the Collector after the date of the publication of the notification under section 4, sub-section (1); or

eighthly, any increase to the value of the land on account of its being put to any use, which is forbidden by law or opposed to public policy.”

5.9 Moreover, only a single bid has been received. Furthermore, the aforesaid bid was made in the year 2021 whereas the Court is required to assess the market value of the acquired land as on 05.02.2010.

5.10 It will be noted here that although the HSIIDC had already issued notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act to acquire the land for the construction of Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway in the year 2005, however, the construction of the aforesaid road started much after the year

namely the Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway was not immediately developed after the land was acquired. In fact, the Manesar-Palwal section was inaugurated in the month of April, 2016, whereas, the Kundli-Manesar section, which would be relevant in the present case, was inaugurated in the month of November, 2018. Moreover, a major portion of the Expressway is elevated, therefore, unless there is a link road, the prices of the land abutting the Expressway did not exponentially increase. The prices of the land increase on account of the better connectivity in the area. This Court had an opportunity to decide the cases of village Patli Hazipur with respect to the acquisition of the land for the construction of Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Expressway in the village Patli Hazipur, the market value of the land was assessed in *Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited v. Om Dutt and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 421 of 2021, decided on 07.10.2021)* @ ₹14,50,000/- approximately on the basis of the policy of the State whereas within a period of five years, the Collector itself has granted an increase of ₹40,00,000/- per acre on the amount of ₹14,50,000/- per acre approximately. Thus, there is no error in the offer made by the LAC.

5.11 The landowners are required to prove by leading the cogent evidence that the LAC has failed to assess the proper market value of the acquired land. In the present case, the landowners have miserably failed to lead material evidence for the determination of market value. In the additional evidence, the landowners have relied upon the Collector's rates which are for the purpose of the collection of stamp duty on the sale deeds.

Ex.HC2 is applicable from 01.04.2011. Similarly, Ex.HC3 is applicable from 01.04.2012. The judgment (Ex.HC4) dated 15.03.2022 has been set aside by a judgment of even date in *Chandan Singh (Since Deceased) through LRs v. State of Haryana and Others (Regular First Appeal No. 752 of 2022)*. Ex.HC5 is an award passed by the LAC with respect to the village Bawra Bakipur. The LAC has offered to pay @ ₹75,00,000/- per acre in the said award. In the absence of evidence to prove that the acquired land of village Bawra Bakipur was comparable with the acquired land of village Patli Hazipur, the awards (Ex.HC5 and Ex.HC6) cannot be relied upon particularly when the sale deed (Ex.R8 and Ex.R17) produced by the HSIIDC prove that the market value of the acquired land was not beyond ₹55,00,000/- per acre as awarded by the LAC.

6. Decision

6.1 Keeping in view the aforesaid discussion, this Court is left with no choice but to dismiss all the appeals filed by the landowners. Resultantly, all the appeals filed by the landowners are dismissed.

6.2 The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, in all the appeals, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

January 09, 2023
“DK”

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

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party’s Name
1.	RFA-369-2022	DAYA RAM AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
2.	RFA-672-2022	M/S UMANG LEASING AND CREDIT COMPANY LTD V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
3.	XOBJR-74-2022	M/S UMANG LEASING AND CREDIT COMPANY LTD

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party’s Name
		V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
4.	RFA-673-2022	AMIT THAKRAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
5.	XOBJR-75-2022	AMIT THAKRAN AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
6.	RFA-485-2022	LALLU RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
7.	RFA-486-2022	DHAN RAJ V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
8.	RFA-487-2022	JAGDISH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
9.	RFA-688-2022	GANGADHAR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
10.	RFA-689-2022	BABU LAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
11.	RFA-690-2022	INDRAJ AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
12.	RFA-694-2022	TARA CHAND DECEASED THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
13.	RFA-171-2022	VIJAY PAL ALIAS VIJAY PAL SINGH AND ANOTHER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
14.	RFA-156-2022	FATEH SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
15.	RFA-158-2022	POHAP SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
16.	RFA-154-2022	SHRI BHAGWAN (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
17.	RFA-140-2022	SARJEET SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
18.	RFA-157-2022	MAHENDER V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
19.	RFA-139-2022	SIS RAM ALIAS SEES RAM V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
20.	RFA-2434-2021	RAJ KUMAR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
21.	RFA-647-2022	JAGDISH CHAND AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
22.	RFA-652-2022	RAMESH KUMAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
23.	RFA-653-2022	KARAMBIR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
24.	RFA-687-2022	BABU LAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
25.	RFA-573-2022	RAM NIWAS AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
26.	RFA-722-2022	OM PARKASH AND ANR. V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
27.	RFA-749-2022	VED PRAKASH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
28.	RFA-752-2022	CHANDAN SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
29.	RFA-753-2022	RAM CHANDER AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
30.	RFA-754-2022	RAMPHAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

Sr. No.	Case No.	Party’s Name
31.	RFA-755-2022	GORDHAN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
32.	RFA-761-2022	RAM MEHAR AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
33.	RFA-786-2022	ARJAN @ ARJUN SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

January 09, 2023
“DK”

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge