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

**RFA No. 112 of 2019 (O&M)
alongwith "33" connected cases*
Reserved On: 04.10.2023
Date of Decision: 31.10.2023**

State of Haryana and another

...Appellants

Versus

Ashok Kumar and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

Mr. Adarsh Jain, Advocate,
Ms. Neha Dewan, Advocate,
Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Advocate,
Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
Mr. Chirag Kundu, Advocate,
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate,
Mr. Himanshu Arora, Advocate,
Mr. Govind Chauhan, Advocate,
for the respondents-landowners.

****

HARKESH MANUJA, J.

CM-4943-CI-2018 & CM-1689-CI-2022 in RFA-2301-2018

Present application bearing (i) CM-4943-CI-2018 is for bringing on record legal representatives of appellant No. 2 (Bishan Gopal @ Bishan Lal), who died on 29.08.2016; similarly (ii) CM-1689-CI-2022 is for bringing on record legal representatives of appellant No. 1 (Krishan Gopal), who died on 21.12.2021.

For the reasons stated in the applications, which have been duly supported by the affidavit(s), the same are **allowed**, subject to all just exceptions. As a result thereof, legal representatives of above appellants are brought on record to pursue the appeal.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record. Registry to do the needful.

CM-2947-CI-2022 in RFA-2904-2018

Present application is for bringing on record legal representatives of appellant No. 1 (Mukesh Chand), who died on 17.03.2021.

For the reasons stated in the application, which has been duly supported by the affidavit, the same is **allowed**, subject to all just exceptions. As a result thereof, legal representatives of above appellant are brought on record to pursue the appeal.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record. Registry to do the needful.

Applications for condonation of delay

In RFA Nos. 112 to 124, 336, 339 & 340 of 2019 (filed by State of Haryana), applications have been filed for condonation of delay of **293 days** in filing the appeal; further in RFA Nos. 337 & 338 of 2019 (filed by State of Haryana), applications have been filed for condonation of delay of **292 days** in filing the appeal; also in RFA No. 597 of 2019 (filed by State of Haryana), application has been filed for condonation of delay of **333 days** in filing the appeal; and in RFA No. 133 of 2020 (filed by landowners), application has been filed for condonation of delay of **592 days** in filing the appeal.

In all applications re:condonation of delay filed in the above respective appeals of State of Haryana, notice stood issued; however one of the appeals bearing RFA No. 133 of 2020, notice of the application is yet to be issued.

Issue notice of the above application re:condonation of delay of 592 days in filing the appeal / RFA No. 133 of 2020.

Learned State Counsel accepts notice of the above application and opposes the prayer made therein; while learned counsel for the landowners oppose the prayer made in the application filed by State of Haryana.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the contents of the applications, which have been supported by affidavit(s).

In view of the averments made in the respective applications and relying upon the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of *"**Ningappa Thotappa Angadi (Dead) through LRs Versus Special Land Acquisition Officer and Another", 2020 (19) SCC 599*** as well as in view of the contents of applications, the prayer is **allowed** and delay in filing the respective appeals, as mentioned above, is hereby condoned, subject to denial of interest for the period of delay in filing the respective appeals by the landowners.

MAIN APPEAL(S)

The present judgment shall dispose of ***34** number of appeals (detail whereof is on the foot of the judgment), filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, the 'Act'), out of which, 19 number of appeals have been filed by the State and 15 number of appeals have been filed by the landowners alongwith 2 cross-objections.

[2] In the appeals and cross-objections filed by the landowners, they are seeking further enhancement of compensation for the acquired land, whereas in the appeals filed by the State, the prayer is for reduction thereof.

[3] In the present set of appeals, challenge has been made to Award dated 30.11.2017 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Faridabad (hereinafter to be referred as "Reference Court"), whereby the market value of the acquired land in question has been assessed @ Rs. 3400/- per square yard , i.e. Rs. 1,64,56,000/- per acre as on the date of Notification under Section 4 of the Act issued on 04.07.2011.

FACTS

[4] Briefly, the facts are that in pursuance of Haryana Govt. Notification under Section 4 of the Act issued on 04.07.2011, followed by Notification dated 02.07.2012 under Section 6 thereof, land measuring 101 Kanals 2 Marlas (12.64 acres), including the land of present respondents-landowners herein, situated in the revenue estate of Village **Baselwa**, Tehsil & District Faridabad, was acquired. The public purpose for acquisition of land was stated to be development and utilization of Master Plan Roads for Sectors 75 to 89, Faridbad. The LAC, vide Award No. 11, dated 20.05.2013, assessed the market value of acquired land @ Rs. 60,00,000/- per acre alongwith other statutory benefits and interest as provided under the Act.

[5] Dissatisfied with the aforesaid Award, landowners / interested persons filed objections under Section 18 of the Act, which were decided vide award dated 30.11.2017 by the Reference Court, whereby market value of the acquired land was assessed @ Rs. 3400/- per square yard.

CONTENTIONS:

ON BEHALF OF LANDOWNERS

[6] Mr. Adarsh Jain, learned counsel for the landowners submits that earlier the land falling in the revenue estate of Village Baselwa was acquired vide Notification dated 14.08.2008 for the same public purpose, i.e. "Development and Utilization of land for Master Plan Roads of Sectors 75 to 89, Urban Estate, Faridabad", wherein the market value was finally assessed @ Rs. 3704/- per square yard by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of ***Banwari Lal & Anr. Versus State of Haryana & Ors.,*** reported as ***2021 (3) RCR (Civil) 843***. The relevant discussion with regard to Village Baselwa in paras-91 to 102 of ***Banwari Lal's case (supra)*** is reproduced as under:-

> *" **Village : Baselwa***
> *91. Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Pallav Shishodia, learned senior counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.*
> *92. As regards land situated in village Baselwa, covered under the third notification dated 14.08.2008, the High Court has determined the fair market price at Rs. 3300/- and Rs.2970/- per sq.yd., respectively.*
> *93. The High Court has adverted to three sale instances Exhibited as P-24, P-25 and P-10, dated 28.12.2006, 28.12.2006 and 24.12.2007 respectively.*
> *94. As regards sale instances of 28.12.2006 of the same day, one at Rs.3657/- per sq.yd. and the other is at Rs.4396/-*

per sq.yd. The third sale instance is dated 24.12.2007 for Rs.5062/- per sq.yd.

95. As regards the third sale instance (Exhibit P-10 dated 24.12.2007 for Rs.5062/- per sq.yd.), the same is after the proposal for acquisition was submitted to the competent authority on 29.06.2007. Hence, that sale instance cannot be taken into account. We discard the same.

96. Reverting to the two sale instances dated 28.12.2006, the High Court has discarded sale instance of Rs.3657/- on the ground that the land in question was a leasehold land. The fact remains that another land in the same village ad-measuring 78 Kanals 18 Marlas was sold for Rs.4396/- per sq.yd. on the same day.

97. As a result, we are persuaded to take the mean of these two sale instances (Exhibits P-24 and P-25, both dated 28.12.2006) which comes to Rs.4026/- (rounded off) per sq.yd.

98. This market price, in our opinion, can be taken as base value of the land to which an increase at the rate of 7.5% per annum needs to be granted. After giving that benefit, deduction of 20% will have to be provided for development charges as provided in other cases.

99. ***Accordingly, the fair market value of the lands situated in Village Baselwa, covered under the third notification comes to Rs.3704/- (Rupees three thousand seven hundred four only) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.4026/- plus Rs.604/- minus Rs.926/-).***

100. Mr. Pallav Shishodia, learned senior counsel appearing for the landowners, submits that the lands in village Baselwa, covered under the third notification, come within the urban area.

101. We do not find merit in this submission and for giving further enhancement. This prayer stands rejected because we have taken over all view of the matter to give benefit to the land owners to the extent possible, which means, we have taken into account all the relevant circumstances of the case.

It is also because the sale instances relied upon by the State which are of lesser value, have been discarded by us.

102. Hence, the appeal(s) filed by the State challenging the enhancement by the High Court stand rejected, whereas the appeal(s) filed by the claimant(s) for enhancement are partly allowed to the above extent. Rest of the benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed. "

[6.1] Relying upon the afore-stated discussion, Mr. Jain further submits that the three sale deeds, i.e. Exhibits P-24, P-25 & P-10, dated 28.12.2006, 28.12.2006 & 24.12.2007 respectively, which were considered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Banwari Lal's case (supra)***, were even proved on record are part of evidence in the case in hand as Exhibits P-22, P-26 & P-23. A comparative chart in this regard is reproduced hereunder:-

Sr. No.	***Details of Sale deeds with exhibits produced in Banwari Lal's case (supra)***		***Details of Sale deeds with exhibits produced in present case***		***Rate per square yard (in Rs.)***
	Exhibit	**Sale deed Dated**	**Exhibit**	**Sale Deed Dated**	
1.	P-24	28.12.2006	P-26	28.12.2006	3657/-
2.	P-25	28.12.2006	P-22	28.12.2006	4396/-
3.	P-10	24.12.2007	P-23	24.12.2007	5062/-

[6.2] It has been further submitted on behalf of the landowners that though in case of ***Banwari Lal (supra)***, the third sale deed dated 24.12.2007 was not considered while making assessment of compensation, the same being in closed proximity with the date of notification under Section 4 therein being 14.08.2008 however, the same needs to be considered in the case in hand, the date of notification under Section 4 of the Act in this case being 04.07.2011, by applying appropriate increase thereupon in terms of difference of time period between the two notifications. For the purpose of applying annual increase, it has been further submitted that the two sale deeds dated 28.12.2006 which were for Rs. 3,657/- & Rs. 4,396/- per square yard, the mean thereof being 4,026/- per square yard and, therefore, for the purpose of evaluating annual increase while comparing these sale deeds with the third sale deed dated 24.12.2007 against Rs. 5,062/- per square yard, the increase for one year from 28.12.2006 to 24.12.2007 comes to Rs. 1,036/- per square yard, i.e. @ Rs. 25.73 per annum.

[6.3] Learned counsel for the landowners, while relying upon decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***The General Manager, Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. Versus Rameshbhai Jivanbhia Patel & Anr.,*** *reported as* ***2008 (4) RCR (Civil) 487***, submits that once from the evidence available on record, it was established that the annual increase towards price of land in Village **Baselwa** between December 2006 to December 2007 has been around 25%, the same should be made applicable over the price / compensation / market value fixed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Banwari Lal's case (supra)*** with respect to the date of notification therein, i.e. 14.08.2008, with market value @ Rs. 3704/- per square yard and by applying 25% appreciation thereupon for a period of about 35 months till the date of notification in the present case [i.e. from 14.08.2008, the date of notification under Section 4 in case of ***Banwari Lal (supra)***, till 04.07.2011; the date of notification in the present case], the market value should have been assessed in the present case @ Rs. 6404/- per square yard (Rs. 3704 + 2700 = Rs. 6404/-) [Calculation of Rs. 2700: Rs. 3704 x 25/100 = Rs. 926; Rs. 926 / 12 = Rs. 77.17; Rs. 77.17 x 35 = Rs. 2700.95].

ON BEHALF OF STATE

[7] On the other hand, learned State Counsel submits that the above arguments raised on behalf of the landowners are belied from their own evidence, in the shape of sale deeds exhibited P-3 to P-23, P-25 to P-30 & P-37, which nowhere reflect an appreciation of 25% per annum towards the market price of land in Village **Baselwa**. It is further submitted that once the evidence in the shape of exemplar sale deeds was available on record having been led by the landowners themselves, the safest mode to assess the amount of compensation was to rely upon those exemplar sale deeds, rather than relying upon a previous award / determination and applying annual increase / appreciation thereupon.

[7.1] Learned State Counsel also submits that no annual appreciation can be awarded in the absence of there being any evidence available on record so as to substantiate the same. While referring to the sale deeds produced by the appellants/ landowners in the shape of Exhibits P-3 to P-13, he further submits that the sale price corresponding to the notification period under Section 6 of the Act was ranging between Rs.5000/- to Rs.6000/-, he also points out that even those sale deeds were pertaining to small parcels of land and as such, appropriate cut needed to be applied upon the sale price fixed therein.

DISCUSSION & REASONING

[8] I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book as well as records of the case. I find substance in the submissions made on behalf of learned counsels for the landowners.

LOCATIONAL AND POTENTIAL VALUE OF THE LAND UNDER ACQUISITION

[9] In the present case, though the acquisition pertains to the year 2011 initiated vide notification dated 04.07.2011 having been issued under Section 4 of the Act for the purpose of development and utilization of master plan roads for Sectors 75 to 89, Faridabad; however, from the pleadings and the documents available on record, it can be traced out that the process of acquisition in these areas of Faridabad commenced with the notification dated 01.05.2006; whereby the land of five different villages was acquired for the purpose of development and utilization of land as residential and commercial areas in Sectors 75 and 80, Faridabad; followed by another notification dated 07.02.2008 pertaining six different villages for the same purpose of Sectors 76, 77 & 78, Urban Estate, Faridabad.

[10] As a matter of fact, the land situated in the revenue estate of Village Baselwa which is the subject matter of present notification / acquisition proceedings never formed part of the first two aforementioned notifications. Having acquired the land for setting up five different sectors for the purposes of development and utilization of residential and commercial activities; with an object to provide connectivity to all these sectors, then came the third notification dated 14.08.2008 for carving out Master plan roads from Sectors 75 to 89 of Faridabad. For the said purpose, land pertaining to 19 different revenue estates was acquired including the land falling in Village **Baselwa**. The Hon’ble Apex Court vide decision dated 14.07.2021 passed in the ***Banwari Lal’s case (supra)***, assessed / determined market value pertaining to the revenue estate of Village Baselwa as regards third notification dated 14.08.2008 to be Rs.3704/- per square yard. Thereafter, present acquisition was carried out in pursuance to the notification dated 04.07.2011 issued under Section 4 of the Act pertaining to different revenue estates, including Village **Baselwa**, Tehsil and District Faridabad, again for the purposes of laying down of the Master Plan Roads of Sectors 75 to 89, Urban Estate, Faridabad for the left out pockets.

[11] Thus, the aforementioned discussion draws this Court to record a conclusive opinion that the land adjoining to the revenue estate of Village **Baselwa** stood already developed for the purposes of residential and commercial activities being abutting the developed / developing area, hence resulting into acquisition for the Master Plan roads for Sectors 75 to 89 twice over.

[12] Moreover, a detailed discussion has been made by the Reference Court as regards the location and potential value of the land under acquisition by recording a positive finding that the land under acquisition was having all basic and necessary amenities with further scope of extension thereof. Even locational value of the land under acquisition has already been noticed by the Reference Court, the same being situated within the controlled area of Faridabad, besides at a distance of about 10 kms. from the National Capital i.e. New Delhi.

DISCUSSION ON MARKET VALUE

[13] By way of evidence, the landowners have proved on record the following sale deeds in the shape of Exhibits P-3 to P-26, P-28 to P-30 & P-35 to P-38, pertaining to the revenue estate of Villages Baselwa & Budhena, besides one for Village Kheri Kalan as well, ranging between 2008 to 2012:-

Sr. No.	Exhibit	Sale Deed No. / Dated	Revenue Estate	Area K-M	Sale consideration (in Rs.)	Total Square yards	Rater per square yard (in Rs.)
1.	P-3	13737 / 29.11.2011	Baselwa	0-3	5,04,000/-	84	6000/-
2.	P-4	1269 / 26.04.2011	Baselwa	0-3	6,00,000/-	100	6000/-
3.	P-5	1750 / 03.05.2011	Baselwa	0-3	6,00,000/-	100	6000/-
4.	P-6	582 / 13.04.2011	Baselwa	0-2	3,05,000/-	61	5000/-
5.	P-7	263 / 08.04.2011	Baselwa	0-5	8,43,000/-	**140.5 / actual (140 as per RC)**	**6000/- / actual (6021/- as per RC)**
6.	P-8	587 / 13.04.2011	Baselwa	0-1½	2,25,000/-	45	5000/-
7.	P-9	575 / 13.04.2011	Baselwa	0-3	5,00,000/-	100	**5000/- / actual (6000/- as per RC)**
8.	P-10	1834 / 04.05.2011	Baselwa	0-5	9,00,000/-	150	6000/-
9.	P-11	597 / 13.04.2011	Baselwa	0-4	6,96,000/-	116	6000/-
10.	P-12	11881 / 24.10.2011	Baselwa	0-3	4,80,000/-	80	6000/-
11.	P-13	10146 / 20.09.2011	Baselwa	0-1	2,34,000/-	39	6000/-
12.	P-14	87 / 03.04.2012	Baselwa	0-3	6,40,000/-	80	8000/-
13.	P-15	19696 / 05.03.2012	Baselwa	0-5	9,60,000/-	160	6000/-
14.	P-16	19350 / 29.02.2012	Baselwa	0-4	7,50,000/-	125	6000/-
15.	P-17	21012 / 26.03.2012	Baselwa	0-3	3,00,000/-	100	3000/-
16.	P-18	18828 / 21.02.2012	Baselwa	0-2	2,40,000/-	40	6000/-
17.	P-19	18713 / 17.02.2012	Baselwa	0-8	26,00,000/-	243	10,699/-
18.	P-20	25979 / 13.03.2013	Baselwa	0-3	8,20,000/-	**102.5 / actual (102 as per RC)**	**8000/- / actual (8039/- as per RC)**

19.	P-21	2338 / 28.05.2013	Baselwa	0-8	38,00,000/-	251	15139/-
20.	P-22	17767 / 28.12.2006	Baselwa	78-8	20,98,43,000/-	47734	4396/-
21.	P-23	20787 / 24.12.2007	Baselwa	24-8	7,47,25,000/-	14762	5062/-
22.	P-24	679 / 18.04.2007	Kheri Kalan	5-0	1,80,00,000/-	3025	5950/-
23.	P-25	1951 / 22.04.2008	Baselwa	0-13	20,00,000/-	403	**4963/- / actual (4975/- as per RC)**
24.	P-26	17768 / 28.12.2006	Baselwa	12-13	2,79,17,000/-	7653	3647/-
25.	P-28	1577 / 16.04.2008	Baselwa	0-13	16,65,290/-	402	**4143/- / actual (4658/- as per RC)**
26.	P-29	1946 / 22.04.2008	Baselwa	1-0	30,00,000/-	605	**4959/- / actual (4658/- as per RC)**
27.	P-30	1568 / 16.04.2008	Baselwa	0-13	16,65,290/-	402	4142/-
28.	**P-35 / actual (P-31/ as per RC)**	786 / 15.04.2010	Bhudena	102-5	30,00,00,000/-	61861	4849/-
29.	P-36	7103 / 13.08.2010	Bhudena	35-12	7,56,50,000/-	21538	3512/-
30.	P-37	1951 / 22.04.2008	Baselwa	0-13	20,00,000/-	**403 / actual (402/- as per RC)**	**4963/- / actual (4975/- as per RC)**
31.	P-38	6125 / 23.07.2010	Kheri Kalan	10-15	2,28,43,750/-	6503	**3513/- actual (3511/- as per RC)**

[14] Perusal of the aforementioned sale deeds clearly reflects that around 2009, the value of the land in Village **Baselwa** was ranging between Rs. 4000/- to Rs. 5000/- per acre; whereas the same went upto Rs. 5000/- to Rs. 6000/- in the year 2011 which alongwith gradual annual appreciation reconciles with the adjudication made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Banwari Lal's case (supra)***; wherein the market value pertaining to the same revenue estate i.e. Village **Baselwa** *qua* the third notification, which was issued on 14.08.2008, was assessed @ Rs. 3704/- per square yards and the same thus needs to be treated the safest and the best reliable source for determination of market value in the present facts by taking it to be Rs. 3704/- per sq. yards as on 14.08.2008.

[15] As discussed hereinabove, once the determination of market value has been assessed by the Hon'ble Apex Court as regards the revenue estate of Village Baselwa pertaining to the notification dated 14.08.2008, the present notification under Section 4 of the Act has been issued on 14.07.2011 pertaining to the same revenue estate of Village **Baselwa**, thus being difference of almost three years between the two.

[16] Now, the question arises as to how much appreciation be awarded to the landowners for the time gap between the two notifications? For the said purpose, at the cost of repetition, we can go back to the sale deeds produced by the landowners, which reflect that the price of the land situated in the revenue estate of Village Baselwa in the year 2008 was ranging between Rs. 4000/- to Rs.5000/- per acre; whereas the same went upto Rs. 6000/- per acre in the year 2011, thereby giving appreciation at the rate of approximately 20% to 25% per annum. Moreover, the discussion rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Banwari Lal's case (supra)*** pertaining to the notification dated 14.08.2008 for Village **Baselwa** also reflects that while determining the market value, two sale deeds dated 28.12.2006 (Exhibits P-24 & P-25 in that case) were relied upon ignoring the sale deed dated 24.12.2007 (Ex. P-10) on the point of same being in close proximity to the date of notification under Section 4 of the Act in the said case, which was dated 14.08.2008. However, notification under Section 4 of the Act in the present case is dated 14.07.2011 and therefore, the said sale deed dated 24.12.2007 can even be taken into consideration and upon doing so, the appreciation between December 2006 to December 2007 also goes more than 25%.

[17] Cumulatively, the land under present acquisition is situated in Village **Baselwa** having been acquired for development and utilisation for Master Plan Roads for Sectors 75 to 89, Faridabad for left out pockets. The acquired land is abutting the already developing Sectors 75 to 80, Faridabad, regarding which, the process of acquisition commenced vide Notifications dated 01.05.2006 & 07.02.2008, issued under Section 4 of the Act. In addition, the land from this very revenue estate of Village **Baselwa** also came to be acquired vide Notification dated 14.08.2008, issued under Section 4 of the Act for the same purpose, meaning thereby that at the time of notification issued under Section 4 of the Act in the present case on 04.07.2011, the same was already adjoining and surrounded by developed / developing residential and commercial area. As such, for the purpose of determining market value, the same having high locational and potential advantage needs to be treated as semi urban land rather than agricultural one. The appreciation about value of land in Village **Baselwa** between years 2008 to 2011 has even been reflected from the sale deeds produced on record which suggests an annual increase of 20% to 25%. Accordingly, taking everything into account, including the extent of land, forming part of the exemplar sale deeds being small, as compared to the area of present acquisition, an annual increase at the rate of 15% at compound rate appears to be justified in the facts of the present case. Resultantly, applying 15% annual increase at compound rate upon Rs. 3,704 per square yard for three years between 14.08.2008 to 04.07.2011, market value in the present case comes to Rs. 5,633/- per square yard for the land under acquisition, notified on 04.07.2011. The said market value pertaining to Village **Baselwa** has been calculated as under:-

Sr. No.	**Description**	**Amount in per square yard (Rs.)**
1.	Rate Calculated in the year 2008 by Apex Court in **Banwari Lal's case (supra)**	3,704.00
Add:	For the year 2009, annual Increase @ 15% of Rs. 3,704/-	555.60
	Total	4,259.60
Add:	For the year 2010, annual Increase @ 15% of Rs. 4,259.60	638.94
	Total	4,898.54
Add:	For the year 2011, annual Increase @ 15% of Rs. 4,898.54	734.78
	Total	5,633.32
	Round off	**5,633.00**

RELIEF

[18] In view of the discussion made hereinabove, the appeals filed on behalf of the appellants-State are **dismissed**, whereas the appeals & cross-objections filed by the respondents-landowners are **allowed**. Resultantly, the award dated 30.11.2017 passed by the Reference Court is modified and the market value for the acquired land with regard to Village **Baselwa** is enhanced to **Rs. 5,633/- per square yard**, besides grant of all other statutory benefits as provided under Sections 23(2), 23(1-A) of the Act as well as interest in terms of Section 28 of the Act.

[19] Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed off.

October 31, 2023 **(HARKESH MANUJA)**
'dk kamra' **JUDGE**

Whether Speaking / Reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : Yes

Sr. No.	Case No.	Case Title
*1.	RFA-112-2019 **(Main Case)**	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** ASHOK KUMAR AND OTHERS
2.	RFA-113-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** MAHADEVI
3.	RFA-114-2019	STATE OF HARYAN AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** MADHU BALA AND OTHERS
4.	RFA-115-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** JITENDER SHARMA AND ANOTHER
5.	RFA-116-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** TEJ RAM AND ANOTHER
6.	RFA-117-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** RAJNI BALA AND ANOTHER
7.	RFA-118-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** MOOL CHAND AND OTHERS
8.	RFA-119-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** KISHAN GOPAL AND OTHERS
9.	RFA-120-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** SUSHILA RANI AND ANOTHER
10.	RFA-121-2019	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, URBA ESTATE, HUDA BUILDING,FARIDABAD ***VERSUS*** CHHIDA SINGH AND ANOTHER
11.	RFA-122-2019 WITH XOBJR-18-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** MAMTA MISHRA AND ANOTHER
12.	RFA-124-2019	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, URBAN ESTATE, FARIDABAD ***VERSUS*** RAKESH GUPTA AND ANOTHER
13.	RFA-123-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** CHANCHAL GOEL AND ANOTHER
14.	RFA-597-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** SUSHMA RANI AND ANOTHER
15.	RFA-336-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** ASHOK KUMAR AND OTHERS
16.	RFA-337-2019	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR, URBAN ESTATE, SECTOR-12, FARIDABAD ***VERSUS*** MUKESH CHAND AND OTHERS

17.	RFA-338-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** BHYARTI AHUJA AND OTHERS
18.	RFA-339-2019	STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ***VERSUS*** RENU GARG
19.	RFA-340-2019 WITH XOBJR-66-2019	THE STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ***VERSUS*** MANJU SAXENA AND ANOTHER
20.	RFA-1127-2018	ASHOK KUMAR & OTHERS ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
21.	RFA-1131-2018	MADHU BALA & OTHERS ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
22.	RFA-1132-2018	ASHOK KUMAR & OTHERS ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS
23.	RFA-2217-2018	CHANCHAL GOEL AND OTHERS ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
24.	RFA-2300-2018	SUSHILA RANI & ANR ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
25.	RFA-2301-2018	KISHAN GOPAL & ORS ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
26.	RFA-1263-2019	RENU GARG ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
27.	RFA-2798-2018	MOOL CHAND AND ORS ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
28.	RFA-2904-2018	MUKESH CHAND AND ORS ***VERSUS*** LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER
29.	RFA-3640-2018	CHHIDA SINGH DECEASED THROUGH HIS LR ***VERSUS*** LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR AND ANOTHER
30.	RFA-4062-2018	JITENDER SHARMA ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
31.	RFA-13612-2018	SUSHMA RANI ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
32.	RFA-13613-2018	RAJNI BALA ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
33.	RFA-4241-2019	MAHADEVI ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
34.	RFA-133-2020	BHYARTI AHUJA AND OTHERS ***VERSUS*** STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

October 31, 2023 **(HARKESH MANUJA)**
'dk kamra' **JUDGE**