IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RFA-3096-2015 (O&M)
Reserved on: 01.12.2022
Date of decision: 06.01.2023

ISHWAR SINGH AND ORS. **..Appellants**

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS. **..Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate
Mr. Rajesh Arora, Advocate
Mr. Amit Kumar Jain, Advocate
Mr. M.L. Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Sudhir Aggarwal, Advocate
for the landowners.

Mr. J.S. Pannu, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Harsh Vardhan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate
for HSIIDC.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

1. **Introduction and background:**

1.1 While praying for modification of the market value assessed in two different awards passed by the Reference Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the RC') on account of involuntary acquisition of the land, the landowners as well as Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (hereinafter referred to as 'the HSIIDC') have filed this batch of appeals (details whereof are at the foot of the judgment). The notification under Section 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') are common. Though, separate awards were passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

to as 'the LAC') as well as RC, however, identical market value has been assessed with respect to the acquired land in both the villages. The total acquired land is in a compact parcel of land which has been acquired for an identical purpose. The evidence led by the parties is also overlapping. The learned counsel representing the parties are *ad idem* that this batch of appeals can conveniently be disposed of by a common judgment.

1.2 The relevant particulars of this batch of appeals, in brief, are as under:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Relevant Date
1.	Preliminary notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act	25.11.2005
2.	Area of acquired the land	356K-16M (in village Khoh) and 785K-11M (in village Kasan)
3.	Location of acquired the land	Village Khoh and Kasan
4.	Purpose of acquisition	Setting up of Chaudhary Devi Lal Industrial Model Township, to be planned and developed as integrated complex for industrial, residential, recreational and other public utilities.
5.	Declaration under Section 6 of the 1894 Act was issued.	24.11.2006
6.	Date and number of LAC award	Award No.7 and 8 dated 24.02.2007
7.	Amount assessed by the LAC	The LAC offered to pay the market value of the acquired land measuring 102 kanals and 16 marlas at the rate of Rs.12,50,000/- per acre.
8.	Date of RC's award	14.01.2015
9.	Amount assessed by the RC	While deciding 20 reference petitions, the RC assessed the market value of the acquired land in village Khoh at the rate of Rs.61,62,583/- per acre.
10.	Date of RC's award	10.02.2015
11.	Amount assessed by the RC	While deciding 30 reference petitions, the RC assessed the identical market value, of the acquired land in village Kasan @ Rs.61,62,583/- per acre.

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

1.3 It may be noted that from reading of both the awards passed by the LAC, it is evident that in village Khoh, the acquired land comprises in Rectangle No.22, 23, 24, 25 and 26, whereas, in village Kasan it comprises in Rectangle No.109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115 and 116 and the passage comprises in Khasra No.302, 671, 672, 674, 676, 677 and 678.

Facts:

1.4 Dissatisfied with the amount offered by the LAC for involuntary acquisition of the land, on the applications filed by the landowners, the matters were referred to the RC. The landowners claimed that the acquired land is located near the Industrial Model Township, Manesar and the industrial units have already been developed nearby. The learned counsel representing the landowners contends that the LAC, while assessing the market value, has not taken into consideration the prevailing price of the land which was not less than Rs.4,00,00,000/- per acre.

1.5 On the other hand, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC has submitted that the LAC has already assessed the market value of the acquired land on the higher side and in fact, the acquired land is agricultural in nature which could not be used for any other purpose except with the permission of the Government. It has been highlighted that the landowners, apart from the market value, have also been held entitled to the benefits under the rehabilitation and resettlement policy and annuity at the rate of Rs.15,000/- per acre for a period of 33 years with increment of Rs.500/- per year.

2. **Evidence produced by the respective parties in village Khoh:**

2.1 In the oral evidence, the landowners have examined the

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

following witnesses:-

PW-1	*Sh. Ranbir Singh Yadav, Assistant, HSIIDC, Industrial Model Township, Manesar*
PW-2	*Sh. Kuldeep, Patwari*

2.2 In the documentary evidence, the landowners have produced the following evidence in support of their case apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is given in para 5.5 of the judgment:-

Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-28	*Allotment letters of the industrial plots*
Ex.P-29 & Ex.P-30	*Site plans*
Ex.P-31 to Ex.P-40	*Documents*

2.3 On the other hand, in oral evidence, HSIIDC examined RW-1 Sh. D.S. Bhatti, Senior Manager, HSIIDC

2.4 The State of Haryana has not produced any documentary evidence apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is given in para 5.5 of the judgment

3. **<u>Evidence produced by the respective parties in village Kasan:</u>**

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

PW-1	*Poonam Jain*
PW-2	*Sh. I.K. Gupta, Retd. SC (civil)*
PW-3	*Sh. Ved Prakash*
PW-4	*Sh. Ranbir Singh Yadav, Assistant in the office of HSIIDC, Industrial Model Township, Manesar*
PW-5	*Sh. Samunder Singh*
PW-6	*Sh. Kuldeep, Patwari*

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

3.2 In the documentary evidence, the landowners have produced the following evidence in support of their case apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is given in para 5.5 of the judgment:-

Ex.P-10 to Ex.P-42	*Copy of sale deeds and allotment letters*
Ex.PW5/A	*Aks-shijra of village Kasan and Khoh*
Ex.PW6/A	*Site plan*
Ex.P-55	*Copy of award dated 14.01.2015*
Ex.P-49	*Copy of conveyance deed*
Ex.P-43, Ex.P-50 & Ex.P-53	*Copy of judgment*

3.3 On the other hand, in oral evidence, HSIIDC examined RW-1 Sh. D.S. Bhatti, Senior Manager, HSIIDC.

3.4 In documentary evidence, the HSIIDC has not produced any evidence, apart from the sale deeds, a tabulated compilation of which is given in para 5.5 of the judgment

4. **<u>Analysis of the awards passed by the RC:-</u>**

4.1 The RC, on appreciation of the pleadings, culled out the following issues for adjudication:-

> *"1. What was the market value of the acquired land on the date of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894? OPP*
> *2. Relief."*

4.2 The RC has held that the sale deed Ex.P-32 dated 28.04.2004 cannot be made the basis to assess the market value of the acquired land as it also includes the value of the building, structure and machinery. This is a consolidated sale deed and in the absence of evidence to compare the price of both the lands, it would not be appropriate to rely upon this sale

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

deed. Sale deeds Ex.P-33 to Ex.P-37 were ignored being post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act i.e. 25.11.2005. The RC, thereafter, discussed the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***HSIIDC Vs. Pran Sukh and others, (2010) 11 SCC 175***, which has been passed while assessing the market value of the acquired land in village Naharpur and Kasan. It was held that there is a time gap of 11 years and 10 days in-between the notifications under Section 4 of the 1894 Act issued for the aforesaid acquisition and the acquisition in the present case, hence, it is not appropriate to assess the market value on the basis of the said judgment. Thereafter, the RC relied upon the sale deed Ex.P-38 dated 09.01.2009 with respect to 7875 sq. meters plot (914.19 sq. yards) which has been sold for Rs.1,46,69,500/-. The per acre price comes to Rs.75,38,395.71/-. After increasing the price cumulatively at the rate of 12% per annum, the Court applied 40% cut and assessed the market value of the acquired land at the rate of Rs.61,62,583/-. While deciding the cases arising from village Kasan, the RC found that the various allotment letters as well as sale deeds produced by the parties cannot be relied upon. Thereafter, the Court chose to rely upon it's own award dated 04.01.2015 passed with respect to the acquired land located in village Khoh and assessed an identical market value.

5. **Discussion and analysis of the arguments of the learned counsel representing the parties:**

5.1 This Bench has heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length, analysed their arguments, and with their able assistance perused the paperbook along with the lower Court record, which was requisitioned.

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

5.2 Sh. M.L. Sharma, Advocate as well as Sh. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate have filed their respective written synopsis.

5.3 The learned counsel representing the landowners while highlighting the location of the acquired land submits that the Industrial Model Township, Manesar, had already been developed, whereas, the acquired land is located adjacent thereto. The learned counsel, while relying upon the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in ***Pran Sukh's case (supra)***, (Ex.P-31) wherein the market value of the acquired land has been assessed at the rate of Rs.21,00,000/- per acre, submits that the LAC should have assessed the market value by granting cumulative increase of 12% for a period of 10 years to assess the market value. In the alternative, he submits that the sale deed Ex.P-32 should have been relied upon by the Court. He further contends that the RC has also erred in excluding the sale deeds Ex.P-33 to Ex.P-38 from consideration on the ground that these are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. While submitting that the landowners are entitled to the highest sale price, he contends that the sale deed Ex.P-33 dated 27.01.2006 should have been relied upon to assess the market value.

5.4 On the other hand, the learned counsel representing the HSIIDC contends that the RC has erred in relying upon the convenience deed Ex.P-39 to assess the market value of the acquired land. He submits that the parcel of land represented by the sale deed Ex.P-39 is with respect to a developed plot in Industrial Model Township, Manesar, hence, the same is not comparable with the acquired land.

5.5 Before proceeding to evaluate and analyse the arguments of the

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

learned counsel representing the parties, it is considered appropriate to compile the complete information in respect of various sale deeds produced by the parties in order to have a bird's eye view of the matter, in a tabulated form:-

SALE DEED PRODUCED BY THE LANDOWNERS							
Sr. No.	**Exhibit Nos.**	**Sale Deed No.**	**Date**	**Total Area (in K-M)**	**Amount (in Rs.)**	**Amount Per Acre (in Rs.)**	**Village**
1	P-32/ P-44	2180	28.04.2004	96K-13M	136200000/-	1,12,73,668/-	Naharpur Kasan
2	P-33	18105	27.11.2006	1 Acre 6K- 16M	2,98,00,000/-	1,61,08,108/-	Naharpur Kasan
3	P-34/ P-45	18628	04.12.2006	1 Acre 4K- 16.5M	2,56,50,000/-	1.60 crore	Naharpur Kasan
4	P-35/ P-46	18742	05.12.2006	5K-13M	1,13,00,000/-	1.60 crore	Naharpur Kasan
5	P-36/ P-47	18743	05.12.2006	3K-14M	74,00,000/-	1.60 crore	Naharpur Kasan
6	P-37/ P-48	19350	14.12.2006	5K-13M	1,13,00,000/-	1.60 crore	Naharpur Kasan
7	P-38/ P-49	21507	09.01.2009	7875 Sq. mtrs.	1,46,69,500/-		IMT Manesar
8	P-2	5245	06.06.2005	600 Sq. yards	9,00,000/-	72,60,000/-	Kasan
9	P-3	5720	13.06.2005	400 sq. yards	6,00,000/-	72,60,000/-	Kasan
10	P-4	5865	14.06.2005	10M	4,50,000/-	72,00,000/-	Kasan
11	P-5	6658	27.06.2005	150 sq. yards	2,25,000/-	72,60,000/-	Kasan
12	P-6	12823	27.09.2005	360 sq. yards	5,40,000/-	72,60,000/-	Kasan
SALE DEED PRODUCED BY THE STATE							
1	R-1	25034	15.03.2005	19K-7M	11,00,000/-	4,54,780/-	Dhana
2	R-2	18135	28.11.2006	22K-16M	4,56,00,000/-	1,60,00,000/-	Naharpur Kasan
3	R-3	18105	27.11.2006	14K-16M	2,98,00,000/-	1,61,08,108/-	Naharpur Kasan

5.6 It may be noted here that the sale deeds bearing No.18135 and 18105 have not been exhibited, although, their certified copies are available. The same are exhibited in view of the amended provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, under Order XIII Rule 4 CPC as amended in the States of Punjab and Haryana and the Union Territory of Chandigarh.

5.7 Before proceeding further, it is appropriate to have a careful study of the location of the acquired land. As per the layout plan Ex.R-1, it is evident that the acquired land is not located on the Delhi-Jaipur Highway. Village Manesar is located on the National Highway, whereas, the acquired

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this order/judgment.

land of village Khoh and Kasan is located towards the Western side of village Manesar. In other words, location of village Manesar is better when compared with village Khoh and Kasan. Towards the Northern side of the acquired land, the Industrial Model Township of Manesar has come up. However, there was no development towards the acquired land.

5.8 It is significant to note that village Kasan and Naharpur Kasan are separate villages and these are not adjoining villages. Their boundaries do not abut each other. While decided Regular First Appeal No.684 of 2021, titled as ***"HSIIDC Vs. Mahender Singh and others", decided on 14.10.2021***, this Court noticed that villages Kasan and Naharpur Kasan are located at a distance and there is no evidence to prove that the market value of the land in both the villages is identical, though, they are located in the same area. In the aforesaid case, the Court was assessing the market value of the land located in village Kasan, acquired for constructing Kundli-Manesar-Palwal Express Highway, Phase VIII. This Court found that the market value of the acquired land in the aforesaid case as on 11.01.2005 was Rs.14,52,480/- per acre. However, on a perusal of the various layout plans produced by the parties, it is evident that the aforesaid parcel of land is located at a distance from the acquired land.

5.9 The RC has correctly held that the sale instance Ex.P-32 dated 28.04.2004 cannot be made the basis to assess the market value of the acquired land because it is a consolidated sale deed vide which building, plant and machinery located in village Naharpur Kasan has also been sold. The sale deeds Ex.P-33 to Ex.P-37 are post the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act and pertain to the land located in village Naharpur

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

Kasan. The RC has also correctly held that the sale deeds Ex.P-2, Ex.P-3, Ex.P-4, , Ex.P-5 and Ex.P-6 relate to small parcels of plots, located in village Kasan, which cannot be made the basis to assess the market value of the acquired land measuring more than 1000 kanals approximately. The sale deeds produced by the HSIIDC Ex.R-1 to Ex.R-3 are also with respect to the plots located in village Dhana and Naharpur Kasan, hence, the same cannot be relied upon.

5.10 On a careful perusal of the RC's record, it is evident that the landowners have produced a large number of allotment letters issued by the HSIIDC with respect to the developed plots in Industrial Model Township, Manesar. The RC has correctly refused to rely upon the same to assess the market value of the acquired land.

5.11 On a careful perusal of the convenience deed Ex.P-38, it is evident that this sale deed is with respect to the industrial plot No.48, Sector 3, Industrial Estate, Industrial Model Township, Manesar, executed on 09.01.2009 in favour of M/s Krishna Maruti Ltd. No doubt, the allotment of this plot was in the year 1999, however, this is with respect to the allotment of industrial plot in an already developed estate, whereas, the acquired land is situated in an undeveloped area, which was being used for agricultural purposes. In the opinion of this Court, the RC has erred in relying upon the convenience deed Ex.P-38, because plot No.38 in Sector 3, Industrial Estate, Industrial Model Township, Manesar, is not comparable with the acquired land which is agricultural in nature. There is no material to prove that the aforesaid plot is a comparable parcel of land. There is no evidence to prove the location of the plot No.48, Sector 3, Industrial Estate, Industrial Model

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

Township, Manesar, to enable the Court to compare its location with the acquired land. While assessing the market value of the acquired land, the Court is required to identify the comparable parcels of land executed during the contemporaneous period. In the absence thereof, it is difficult to assess a fair market value. The landowners are required to prove that the amount offered by the LAC is inadequate. For developing land into an Industrial Model Township, a substantial chunk of land is utilized for providing common facilities like roads, park, parking area, electricity supply sub-station etc. which demands a lot of expenditure and time. Hence, it is not prudent to rely upon the allotment letter issued for a developed area. As already noticed, the landowners have produced a large number of allotment letters issued with respect to the various industrial sites, SCO's, booths in a developed industrial area. The RC has correctly refused to rely upon the same.

5.12 The landowners have also relied upon the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in ***Pran Sukh's case (supra)***. They submit that the market value assessed in the aforesaid judgment should be treated as the base value and market value of the acquired land be calculated by granting cumulative escalation @ 12% per annum on the base value. In that case, the Court was assessing the market value of the acquired land for Industrial Model Township located in village Naharpur Kasan, Kasan, Khoh, Manesar etc. The Supreme Court assessed the market value of the acquired land on 15.11.1994 at the rate of Rs.21,00,000/- per acre. However, there is no evidence to prove that the location of the aforesaid acquired land is comparable with the present case. Moreover, there is a time gap of nearly 11

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

years in both the notifications. Thus, the aforesaid judgment cannot be relied upon. Further, it may be noted here that village Dhana is also located nearby. The sale deed Ex.R-1 proves that the land measuring 19 kanals and 7 marlas, which is nearly more than two and a half (2 1/2) acres has been sold at a total price of Rs.11,00,000/- . In other words, the land has been sold at less than Rs.5,00,000/- per acre.

5.13 It may be noted here that the Court while assessing the market value of the acquired land does not grant any decree of declaration. The market value is assessed on the basis of the evidence produced by the parties. Hence, the assessment is based upon the quality of evidence brought before the Court. Undoubtedly, some amount of projections are permissible while assessing the market value, however, it still has to be based upon the evidence produced on record. In the absence of comparable sale deeds of the contemporaneous period, it would not be appropriate for the Court to assess the market value by relying upon the sale instances which are not comparable. The Supreme Court in ***Chiman Lal Hargovinddass vs. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Poona and another, (1988) 3 SCC 751***, has laid down the general principles of assessment of the market value which are extracted as under:-

> *4. The following factors must be etched on the mental screen:*
> *(1) A reference under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act is not an appeal against the award and the court cannot take into account the material relied upon by the Land Acquisition Officer in his award unless the same material is produced and proved before the court.*
> *(2) So also the award of the Land Acquisition Officer is not to be treated as a judgment of the trial court open or exposed to challenge before the court hearing the reference. It is merely an offer made by the Land Acquisition Officer and the material utilised by him for*

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

making his valuation cannot be utilised by the court unless produced and proved before it. It is not the function of the court to sit in appeal against the award, approve or disapprove its reasoning, or correct its error or affirm, modify or reverse the conclusion reached by the Land Acquisition Officer, as if it were an appellate court.

(3) The court has to treat the reference as an original proceeding before it and determine the market value afresh on the basis of the material produced before it.

(4) The claimant is in the position of a plaintiff who has to show that the price offered for his land in the award is inadequate on the basis of the materials produced in the court. Of course the materials placed and proved by the other side can also be taken into account for this purpose.

(5) The market value of land under acquisition has to be determined as on the crucial date of publication of the notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act (dates of notifications under Sections 6 and 9 are irrelevant).

(6) The determination has to be made standing on the date line of valuation (date of publication of notification under Section 4) as if the valuer is a hypothetical purchaser willing to purchase land from the open market and is prepared to pay a reasonable price as on that day. It has also to be assumed that the vendor is willing to sell the land at a reasonable price.

(7) In doing so by the instances method, the court has to correlate the market value reflected in the most comparable instance which provides the index of market value.

(8) Only genuine instances have to be taken into account. (Sometimes instances are rigged up in anticipation of acquisition of land.)

(9) Even post-notification instances can be taken into account (1) if they are very proximate, (2) genuine and (3) the acquisition itself has not motivated the purchaser to pay a higher price on account of the resultant improvement in development prospects.

(10) The most comparable instances out of the genuine instances have to be identified on the following considerations:

(i) proximity from time angle,

(ii) proximity from situation angle.

(11) Having identified the instances which provide the index of market value the price reflected therein may be taken as the norm and the market value of the land under acquisition may be deduced by making suitable

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

adjustments for the plus and minus factors vis-à-vis land under acquisition by placing the two in juxtaposition.

(12) A balance-sheet of plus and minus factors may be drawn for this purpose and the relevant factors may be evaluated in terms of price variation as a prudent purchaser would do.

(13) The market value of the land under acquisition has thereafter to be deduced by loading the price reflected in the instance taken as norm for plus factors and unloading it for minus factors.

(14) The exercise indicated in clauses (11) to (13) has to be undertaken in a common sense manner as a prudent man of the world of business would do. We may illustrate some such illustrative (not exhaustive) factors:

	Plus factors		Minus factors
1	smallness of size	1	largeness of area
2	proximity to a road	2	situation in the interior at a distance from the road
3	frontage on a road	3	narrow strip of land with very small frontage compared to depth
4	nearness to developed area	4	lower level requiring the depressed portion to be filled up
5	regular shape	5	remoteness from developed locality
6	level vis-à-vis land under acquisition	6	some special disadvantageous factor which would deter a purchaser
7	special value for an owner of an adjoining property to whom it may have some very special advantage		

(15) The evaluation of these factors of course depends on the facts of each case. There cannot be any hard and fast or rigid rule. Common sense is the best and most reliable guide. For instance, take the factor regarding the size. A building plot of land say 500 to 1000 sq. yds. cannot be compared with a large tract or block of land of say 10,000 sq. yds. or more. Firstly while a smaller plot is within the reach of many, a large block of land will have to be developed by preparing a lay out, carving out roads, leaving open space, plotting out smaller plots, waiting for purchasers (meanwhile the invested money will be blocked up) and the hazards of an entrepreneur. The factor can be discounted by making a deduction by way of an allowance at an appropriate rate ranging approximately between 20 per cent to 50 per cent to account for land required to be set apart for carving out lands and plotting out small plots. The discounting will to some extent also depend on whether it is a rural area or urban area, whether building activity is picking up, and whether waiting period during which the capital of the entrepreneur would be locked up, will be longer or shorter and the attendant hazards.

(16) Every case must be dealt with on its own fact pattern bearing in mind all these factors as a prudent purchaser of land in which position the judge must place himself.

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

(17) These are general guidelines to be applied with understanding informed with common sense."

5.14 If we apply the aforesaid test in the present case, it is evident that none of the sale exemplars are of parcels of the land which could be compared with the acquired land.

5.15 It may be noted here that a common notification of village Kasan, Khoh and Manesar was issued on 25.11.2005. The landowners of village Manesar did not seek reference under Section 18 of the 1894 Act. In other words, though, the acquired land of village Manesar is near the National Highway but still the landowners did not apply under Section 18 of the 1894 Act.

5.16 Thus, it is proved that the acquired land is neither located near the National Highway nor there is any cogent evidence to prove that the amount offered by the LAC was not adequate. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that the award passed by the RC is not sustainable.

6. **Decision:**

6.1 In view of the aforesaid discussion, the awards passed by the RC on 14.01.2015 and 10.02.2015, are set aside and the LAC's award dated 24.02.2007 is upheld.

6.2 Resultantly, the appeals filed by the HSIIDC are allowed, whereas, that of the landowners are dismissed.

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

06th January, 2023 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
Ay **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned *: Yes/No*

Whether reportable *: Yes/No*

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

Sr. No.	Case No.	Parties Details
1.	**RFA-3096-2015**	**ISHWAR SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS**
2.	RFA-2144-2016	JAGMAL (DECEASED) TH. LR V/S HARYANA STATE AND ORS
3.	RFA-2411-2016	JHUTHAR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S HARYANA STATE AND ORS
4.	RFA-3274-2015	SMT. MAMTA BAJAJ AND ANR V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
5.	RFA-3275-2015	KANTA RANI V/S THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
6.	RFA-3582-2015	SMT. POONAM JAIN V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
7.	RFA-3588-2015	SHER SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
8.	RFA-3672-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S JAGMAL AND ORS
9.	RFA-3673-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S GAJRAJ AND ORS
10.	RFA-3675-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S MAKKAR AND ORS
11.	RFA-3676-2015	HSIIDC V/S DESRAJ AND ORS
12.	RFA-3677-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S RAM NIWAS AND ORS
13.	RFA-3678-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S RAJ KUMAR AND ORS
14.	RFA-3679-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S NARESH AND ORS
15.	RFA-3680-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S NEKI RAM AND ORS
16.	XOBJR-166-CI-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) V/S NEKI RAM AND ORS
17.	RFA-3681-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S BRAHAM SINGH AND ORS
18.	RFA-3682-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S PRABHU SINGH AND ORS
19.	RFA-3683-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S JHUTHAR AND ORS
20.	RFA-3684-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S MAHABIR SINGH AND ORS
21.	RFA-3685-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S MANGAT SINGH AND ORS

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

22.	XOBJR-158-CI-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) V/S MANGAT SINGH (SINCE DECEASED) AND ORS
23.	RFA-3686-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S BAKHTAWAR AND ORS
24.	RFA-3687-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S RAJ PAL AND ORS
25.	RFA-3688-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S BIRBAL AND ORS
26.	XOBJR-159-CI-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) V/S BIRBAL AND ORS
27.	RFA-3689-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S SATBIR AND ORS
28.	XOBJR-157-CI-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) V/S SATBIR AND ORS
29.	RFA-3690-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S VIRENDER SINGH @ NARENDER SINGH AND ORS
30.	RFA-3691-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S VED PARKASH AND ORS
31.	RFA-3692-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S PRABHU SINGH AND ORS
32.	RFA-3693-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S SMT. MAMTA BAJAJ AND ORS
33.	RFA-3694-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S BIRBAL AND ORS
34.	XOBJR-154-CI-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) V/S BIRBAL AND ORS
35.	RFA-3695-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S SMT. POONAM JAIN AND ORS
36.	RFA-3696-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S SHER SINGH AND ORS
37.	XOBJR-155-CI-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) V/S SHER SINGH AND ORS
38.	RFA-3697-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S RAM NIWAS AND ORS
39.	XOBJR-5-CI-2017	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S RAM NIWAS AND ORS
40.	RFA-3698-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S BALBIR AND ORS
41.	RFA-3699-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S MAHIPAL AND ORS
42.	XOBJR-156-CI-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) V/S MAHIPAL AND ORS
43.	RFA-3700-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S SMT. KANTA RANI AND ORS

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

44.	RFA-3701-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S DAMAN SINGH AND ORS
45.	RFA-3674-2015	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC LTD.) V/S SAJAN SINGH AND ORS
46.	RFA-3934-2016	MAKKAR (DECEASED) TH. LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
47.	RFA-485-2016	BRAHAM SINGH & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
48.	RFA-556-2017	VIRENDER SINGH @ NARENDER SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
49.	RFA-6862-2015	HSIIDC & ANR V/S SUKHDEV & ORS
50.	RFA-6863-2015	HSIIDC & ANR V/S GANPAT SINGH AND ORS
51.	RFA-6864-2015	HSIIDC & ANR V/S RAM NIWAS AND ORS
52.	RFA-6865-2015	HSIIDC & ANR V/S RAM HAMESH & ORS
53.	XOBJR-253-CI-2016	HSIIDC & ANR V/S RAM HAMESH & ORS
54.	RFA-6866-2015	HSIIDC & ANR V/S ISHWAR SINGH & ORS
55.	RFA-6867-2015	HSIIDC & ANR V/S SHIV DUTT & ORS
56.	RFA-6868-2015	HSIIDC & ANR V/S KRISHAN KUMAR & ORS
57.	RFA-6869-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S JAGMAL & ANR
58.	RFA-6870-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S RAJA RAM AND ORS
59.	XOBJR-242-CI-2016	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S RAJA RAM AND ORS
60.	RFA-6871-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S PRABHU AND ORS
61.	RFA-6872-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S MUKESH & ORS
62.	RFA-6873-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S SHEO NARAIN @ SHIV NARAIN & ORS
63.	RFA-6874-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S JHUTHAR & ANR
64.	RFA-6875-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S PRABHU SINGH AND ORS
65.	RFA-6876-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S RAJPAL AND ORS
66.	RFA-6877-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S SHER SINGH DECEASED THR. HIS LRS AND ANR
67.	RFA-6878-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRMAKKAR AND ORS
68.	RFA-6879-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S SIRI KRISHAN AND ORS
69.	XOBJR-245-CI-	HSIDC (NOW HSIIDC) AND ANR. V/S SIRI

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.

	2016	KRISHAN AND ORS.
70.	RFA-6880-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S RAM NIWAS AND ORS
71.	RFA-6881-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S PURAN SINGH AND ANR
72.	RFA-6882-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S RATNI & ORS
73.	RFA-6883-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S GORDHAN & ANR
74.	RFA-6884-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S SHEODAN SINGH & ORS
75.	RFA-6885-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S JEET RAM AND ORS
76.	RFA-6886-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S DHARAM SINGH & ORS
77.	RFA-6887-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S AMAR SINGH AND ORS
78.	RFA-6888-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S BALBIR & ANR
79.	RFA-6889-2015	HSIIDC AND ANRV/S KAUSAL & ORS
80.	XOBJR-5-2021	HSIIDC AND ANOTHER V/S KUSHAL AND ORS
81.	RFA-7262-2015	DES RAJ V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
82.	RFA-7263-2015	BALBIR (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
83.	RFA-7264-2015	MAHENDER SINGH V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
84.	RFA-7265-2015	RAJ PAL AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
85.	RFA-7661-2015	PRABHU (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
86.	RFA-7664-2015	PRABHU (DECEASED) TH. LRS & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
87.	RFA-7665-2015	PRABHU (DECEASED) THR. LRS & ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS
88.	RFA-777-2016	MAHABIR SINGH AND ORS V/S STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

MOHD AYUB
2023.01.30 12:16
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order/judgment.