**158**

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

**RFA-2208-2019 (O&M) and other connected cases**
**Date of Decision: April 10, 2026**

**SMT. BHAGWANI (SINCE DECEASED) THR. LRS. AND ORS.**
.......Appellants

Versus

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS** ........Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Mr. M.S. Rana, Advocate
for the appellant in RFA Nos.2073, 2074,
2075, 2076 and 2289 of 2019.

Mr. S.P. Chahar, Advocate and
Ms. Savita Chahar, Advocate for appellant in RFA-2235-2019.

Mr. Sajjan Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate for the appellants in
RFA Nos.2204 to 2209 of 2019.

Mr. Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana.

****

**HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)**

Vide this common order, a batch of 14 Regular First Appeal(s) shall stand disposed of, details of which are mentioned in the foot note of the judgment. For convenience, the facts are drawn from **RFA-2208-2019**.

2. By way of present appeal(s), challenge has been laid to the judgment dated 05.12.2018 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak (hereinafter to be referred as the '***Reference Court***') whereby the reference petition filed under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as '***the Act***') by the

appellants-landowners, seeking enhancement of compensation, was dismissed.

3. Briefly stating, certain land, situated within the revenue estate of Village Garhi Bohar, District Rohtak was acquired for the public purpose, namely, "*for development and utilization of residential and commercial Sector 27, Rohtak*" vide notifications dated 11.04.2002 and 08.04.2003 issued under Sections 4 and 6 respectively of the Act. The Land Acquisition Collector (for short '***the LAC***') passed Award No.1 dated 06.04.2005 assessing the market value @ Rs.12,50,000/- per acre along with other statutory benefits under the Act.

4. The appellants-landowners, feeling dissatisfied with the award, sought reference under Section 18 of the Act pleading that the price of acquired land was not less than Rs.1,00,00,000/- per acre as the same was situated near Rohtak-Delhi National Highway and numerous prestigious institutions. It was also pleaded that the acquired land was situated within National Capital Region; surrounded by densely populated residential, industrial and commercial area.

5. Upon notice, the same was contested by the respondent(s)-State by way of filing written statement, asserting that the LAC had duly taken into consideration the rates furnished by the District Collector as well as the escalation in land prices thus, the compensation granted in favour of appellants-landowners was just and adequate.

6. Upon framing of issues and considering the evidence led by the parties, the learned Reference Court vide award dated 05.12.2018, dismissed the reference petition filed by the appellants-landowners.

7. Aggrieved of the aforesaid award dated 05.12.2018 passed by the learned Reference Court, the appellants-landowners filed the present appeal(s).

**CONTENTION(S):**

**ON BEHALF OF THE LANDOWNER(S):-**

8. Impugning the aforementioned award, Sh. S.P. Chahar, learned counsel for the appellants-landowners submits that the learned Reference Court erred having discarded the sale instances produced by them in the form of Exs. P-1 to P-5 and Ex.P-7. He contends that though the sale instances pertained to the period post-notification under Section 4 of the Act, however, by applying the doctrine of de-escalation over the base price derived thereof, the market value was required to be re-assessed.

8.1. Learned counsel also points out that this Court vide decision dated 16.03.2022 passed in ***RFA-1537-2016*** titled as ***"Smt. Chander (Since deceased) through her legal heirs and others Vs. State of Haryana and others"*** assessed the market value @ Rs.42,51,000/- per acre for the same revenue estate of village Garhi Bohar, in relation to a subsequent acquisition which commenced vide notification dated 15.12.2006 under Section 4 of the Act, therefore, the market value was required to be enhanced in favour of the appellants-landowners in the present appeal(s). He thus prays that on the basis of evidence on record, the market value was required to be re-assessed and the appeal(s) preferred at the instance of landowners were to be allowed.

**ON BEHALF OF THE STATE:-**

9. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent(s)-State submits that as per the sale instances produced by the respondent(s), the market value per acre for the acquired land varied between Rs.1,50,000/- to Rs. 2,50,000/-. He therefore asserts that, keeping in view the sale price reflected in such sale deeds, no interference was called for with the award passed by the LAC, as per which the landowners were sufficiently compensated by already assessing the market value @ Rs. 12,50,000/- per acre.

9.1. Learned State counsel also points out that since the sale deeds produced by the appellants-landowners pertained to the period post-notification under Section 4 of the Act in the case(s) in hand, as such, the same were liable to be discarded. He thus prays that the impugned award passed by the learned Reference Court, being based on proper appreciation of evidence and material available on record, calls for no interference therefore these appeal(s) were liable to be dismissed.

10. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book.

**DISCUSSION AND REASONING: -**

11. In order to decide the issue of re-assessment of market value of the acquired land, details of the sale instances produced by the landowners as well as State, in furtherance of their claims are thus, reproduced hereunder:-

**SALE DEEDS PRODUCED BY THE APPELLANTS - LANDOWNERS:-**

| Sr. No. | Ex. | Vasika No. | Date | Land area (Kanal – Marla) | Total sale consideration (In Rs.) | Revenue estate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | P-1 | 924 | 04.05.2006 | 16 K - 8 M | 1,84,54,687/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 2 | P-2 | 925 | 04.05.2006 | 9 K - 11.68 M | 1,07,82,188/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 3 | P-3 | 926 | 04.05.2006 | 22 K - 19.32 M | 2,58,36,562/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 4 | P-4 | 928 | 04.05.2006 | 14 K - 10 M | 1,63,11,562/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 5 | P-5 | 12020 | 20.01.2006 | 19 K - 1 M | 2,49,58,125/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 6 | P-7 | 2417 | 25.05.2011 | 9 K - 13 M | 2,46,07,500/- | Garhi Bohar |

**SALE DEEDS PRODUCED BY RESPONDENT(S)-STATE:-**

| Sr. No. | Ex. | Regd No. | Date | Total sale consideration | Land area | Amount Per acre | Revenue estate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | R3 | 96 | 05.04.2005 | 33,000/- | 1K - 15M | 1,50,857/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 2. | R4 | 710 | 21.04.2004 | 43,500/- | 2K - 6M | 1,51,304/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 3. | R17 | 2198 | 27.05.2005 | 52,000/- | 2K - 15M | 1,51,272/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 4. | R5 | 160 | 09.04.2002 | 35,000/- | 1K - 12M | 1,75,000/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 5. | R6 | 3633 | 06.11.2002 | 20,000/- | 0K - 19M | 1,68,421/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 6. | R7 | 3214 | 01.10.2002 | 1,20,000/- | 4K - 2M | 2,34,146/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 7. | R8 | 6491 | 02.01.2002 | 22,000/- | 1K - 0M | 1,76,000/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 8. | R9 | 3047 | 18.09.2002 | 2,80,000/- | 14K - 18M | 1,50,335/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 9. | R10 | 26 | 03.04.2003 | 25,000/- | 1K - 0M | 2,00,000/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 10. | R11 | 1187 | 12.06.2003 | 1,00,000/- | 5K - 6M | 1,50,943/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 11. | R12 | 523 | 12.05.2003 | 31,000/- | 1K - 13M | 1,50,303/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 12. | R13 | 1849 | 08.07.2003 | 3,90,000/- | 15K - 12M | 2,00,000/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 13. | R14 | 2202 | 18.07.2003 | 1,29,500/- | 6K - 18M | 1,50,144/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 14. | R15 | 2775 | 11.08.2003 | 22,500/- | 1K - 4M | 1,50,000/- | Garhi Bohar |
| 15. | R16 | 4195 | 06.10.2003 | 83,500/- | 4K - 9M | 1,50,112/- | Garhi Bohar |

12. A perusal of the sale deeds produced by respondent(s)-State shows that the base price reflected therein ranged between Rs.1,50,000/- and Rs.2,50,000/- per acre. However, even the LAC vide its award dated 05.12.2018, assessed the market value @

Rs.12,50,000/- per acre, which is more than five times the consideration reflected in the sale deeds produced by the respondent(s). In such circumstances, the said sale deeds produced by respondent(s) cannot be considered to be *bona fide* and genuine sale transactions representing the true value of the subject land at the time of its acquisition.

13. Further, all the sale instances produced by the appellants-landowners pertain to the period post-notification under Section 4 of the Act. However, since all the sale instances relate to the revenue estate of Village Garhi Bohar, the same can be taken into consideration for determining the market value of the acquired land in the present case(s) by applying the doctrine of de-escalation. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in "***Ram Kishan (Since Deceased) Through his LRs Etc Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.***" reported as ***2025 INSC 441*** whereby the principle of de-escalation and its applicability were discussed. The relevant paragraph Nos.25 and 26 therefrom are reproduced hereunder:-

> *"25. In Peerappa Hanmantha Harijan (Dead) by Legal Representatives and Others v. State of Karnataka and Another, (2015) 10 SCC 469, finding that lands which were acquired by a later notification in 1988 were adjacent to the lands acquired in the case in question in 1981, this Court applied the principle of de-escalation. The relevant parts of the judgment are set out hereunder:*
>
> > *"77. Further, the land which has been covered under notification in 1988 is also adjacent to the residential sites which were formed. The landowners in that case produced the sale deeds of the years 1986 and 1988 respectively, which was 2 years and 2 months earlier respectively to the notification issued in the year 1988 and some of which were two to three years earlier. Taking the said relevant facts into consideration, the High Court of Karnataka redetermined the compensation at Rs. 7.5 per square feet of land bearing Survey No. 389 covered in award passed in MFA No. 3796 of 2005 and Cross-Objection No. 213 of 2005 after giving deduction towards the developmental charges, de-*

*escalation and conversion charges. The same method should be applied in the case on hand.*

*78. Further, the High Court ought to have taken into consideration the relevant fact that though the final notification for the land covered in MFA No. 3796 of 2005 and Cross-Objection No. 213 of 2005 was in the year 1988, it was for industrial development and the said land was also leased in favour of the allottee Company by KIADB to be used for the industrial development. The land along with the other lands covered in the 1981 notification was also acquired by the State Government for the purpose of the industrial development and allotted to the Company for the development of the industrial estate. Therefore, apart from the fact that there was a gap of 7 years in which the lands of the appellants were notified for acquisition to the land covered in MFA No. 3796 of 2005 and Cross-Objection No. 213 of 2005, it is an admitted fact that there is similarity in the nature of the land and the purpose for which they were acquired.*

*80. As per the survey conducted by the State Government, it is an undisputed fact that mineral is available in the land and the Company is extracting the same to be used as raw material for the manufacture of cement in its factory. Therefore, though the land in the present case is a short distance away from the lands covered in MFA No. 3796 of 2005 and Cross-Objection No. 213 of 2005, both have been acquired for the purpose of industrial development and sought to be used for the same purpose by the Company. The land of the appellants herein along with other lands that was acquired vide notification in 1981 has been allotted in favour of the Company for the purpose of extracting the mineral of limestone which is the raw material used for the purpose of manufacturing the cement used for the commercial purpose. Therefore, the land of the appellants is acquired for the non-agricultural potentiality and the same is used for commercial purpose. Therefore, determining deductions towards de-escalation at 5% per year for 7 years and 10% towards waiting and other incidental charges would justify the redetermination of the market value of the land of the appellants."*

*26. Moreover, in Chandrashekar (dead) by LRs and Others v. Land Acquisition Officer and Another, (2012) 1 SCC 390, this Court, while recognising the Principle of De-escalation held in Para 37, 40 and 42 as under:-*

*37. Even though escalation of market price of land is a question of fact, which should ordinarily be proved through cogent evidence yet, keeping in mind ground realities, and taking judicial notice thereof, we are of the view that land prices are on the rise throughout the country. The* *outskirts of Gulbarga Town are certainly not an exception to the rule. The exemplar sale deed dated 30-12- 1983 was executed exactly 1 year 7 months and 17 days after the publication of the preliminary Notification on 13-5-1982. Keeping in mind the judgments referred to hereinabove, we are of the 9 / 15 LAW FINDER Licensed To: Sachin Balda Advocate PDF downloaded from the online archives of Chawla Publications(P) Ltd. view, that no fault can be found with the determination rendered by the High Court in making a deduction of 10% under the head of "de-escalation", specially when the period in question exceeded one year (as for annual deductions), by 7 months and 17 days.*

*40. Based on the aforesaid deductions, the High Court calculated the market value of the acquired land at Rs. 67,954 per acre. In spite of the above, the market value of the acquired land for disbursement of compensation to the land-losers was fixed by the High Court at Rs. 65,000 per acre. A perusal of the judgment rendered by the High Court reveals that in allowing final compensation at the rate of Rs. 65,000 per acre to the land-losers, the High Court had placed reliance on market value fixed by the High Court itself in an earlier case. In this behalf, it would be pertinent to mention, that the High Court had awarded Rs. 65,000 per acre as compensation payable to the landlosers, in an earlier process of litigation pertaining to acquisition of land, out of the same notification (under which the appellants' land was acquired). The aforesaid determination was rendered in respect of the land acquired from the revenue estate of Badepur Village.*

*42. The conclusions drawn by us hereinabove apply equally to Civil Appeals Nos. 8899-901 of 2011. In this behalf it would also be pertinent to mention, that the conclusions drawn by us pertain to acquisition of land falling in the revenue estate of Village Badepur. Insofar as the instant set of appeals are concerned, they pertain to land acquired from the revenue estate of Village Rajapur. The High Court, while making a reference to the land acquired from Village Rajapur, noticed that Village Rajapur had a lower market value as it was farther from the nerve centre of Gulbarga Town as compared to Village Badepur. As such, we are of the view that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, it would be just and appropriate to affirm the compensation determined by the High Court at Rs. 65,000 per acre, even for the land acquired from the revenue estate of Village Rajapur."*

13.1. The sale instances Exs. P-1 to P-5 pertained to the year 2006, whereas the sale instance Ex. P-7 related to the year 2011. Since the acquisition in the present case commenced vide notification dated 11.04.2002 under Section 4 of the Act, it would be appropriate to take into account the sale instances Exs. P-1 to P-5, which pertained to the year 2006 and were in closer temporal proximity to the acquisition proceedings in question. At the cost of repetition, the details of the sale instances Exs. P-1 to P-5 are recapitulated hereunder:-

| S. No. | Party/Case No. | Award No. | Date | Khasra Nos. | Area | Amount (Rs.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | P-1 | 924 | 4.5.2006 | 343// 6/2, 7/1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23/1; 344// 11/2, 12/2/2, 20/1, 20/2 | 16 Kanal 8 Marla | 90,02,286 / 1,84,54,687 |
| 2 | P-2 | 925 | 4.5.2006 | 343// 6/2, 7/1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23/1; 344// 11/2, 12/2/2, 20/1, 20/2 | 9 Kanal 11.68 Marla | 90,00,156 / 1,07,82,188 |
| 3 | P-3 | 926 | 4.5.2006 | 343// 6/2, 7/1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23/1; 344// 11/2, 12/2/2, 20/1, 20/2 | 22 Kanal 19.32 Marla | 89,99,934 / 2,58,36,562 |
| 4 | P-4 | 928 | 4.5.2006 | 343// 6/2, 7/1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23/1; 344// 11/2, 12/2/2, 20/1, 20/2 | 14 Kanal 10 Marla | 89,99,482 / 1,63,11,562 |
| 5 | P-5 | 12020 | 20.01.2006 | 302// 18/3, 23/1; 314// 15/1, 17 | 19 Kanal 1 Marla | 1,04,81,102 / 2,49,58,125 |

13.2. A perusal of the above sale instances Exs. P-1 to P-5 shows that the sale consideration reflected in these sale deeds was closely range-bound between Rs.89,99,000/- per acre to Rs. 1,05,00,000/- per acre. In such circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that taking average of the aforementioned five sale instances would be the most appropriate way to determine the market value in the case(s) in hand. The aforesaid view is also derived from decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of "***Bharat Petroleum Corpn. Ltd. v. Phoolvati Dharambir Agarwal"*** reported as ***2023 SCC OnLine SC 2162***, whereby it was held that the Courts can deviate from the general principle of taking the highest sale instance by taking average of the sale deed(s) and the same would depend upon the facts of the case. Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court in case of "***Anjani Molu Dessai vs. State of Goa"*** reported as ***(2010) 13 SCC 710*** and in the latest decision of "***Horrmal (Deceased) through his LRs and others vs. State of Haryana"*** reported as ***2024(4) RCR(Civil) 758,*** held that where there are several sale instances of similar nature of land with prices ranging in a narrow bandwidth, the average thereof can be taken as representing the market price. The relevant extract of ***Horrmal's case (supra)*** is extracted hereunder:-

> *"28. This view has been reiterated in* ***Sh. Himmat Singh v. State of M.P., (2013) 16 SCC 392*** *where a three-judge bench of this Court consolidated various precedents to affirm that in circumstances where there are multiple sale deeds available for consideration, the Court shall rely on the highest valued exemplars unless the prices fall within a narrow range, in which case calculating an average of the values therein may be more congruous."*

14. However, in view of the discussion made hereinabove, the sale instances Exs. P-1 to P-5 pertained to the period subsequent to the notification under Section 4 of the Act in the present case(s), thus, after applying depreciation @ 12% per annum on the respective base price per acre derived from the aforementioned sale instances upto the date of notification under Section 4 of the Act, the average base price per acre comes to Rs. 48,32,548/- as per the calculation below:-

| Exhibit / Date of Execution of sale deed (1) | Rate Per Acre (Rs.) (2) | Section 4 Notification Date (3) | Time Period Between Notification & Execution (4) | Interest Rate (5) | Interest Amount (Rs.) (6) | Amount after de-escalation (6-2) (Rs.) (7) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| P-1/ 04.05.2006 | 90,02,286/- | 11.04.2002 | 04 Years 0 Months 23 Days | 12% | 43,92,129.00 | 46,10,157.00 |
| P-2/ 04.05.2006 | 90,00,156/- | 11.04.2002 | 04 Years 0 Months 23 Days | 12% | 43,91,089.81 | 46,09,066.19 |
| P-3/ 04.05.2006 | 89,99,934/- | 11.04.2002 | 04 Years 0 Months 23 Days | 12% | 43,90,981.00 | 46,08,953.00 |
| P-4/ 04.05.2006 | 89,99,482/- | 11.04.2002 | 04 Years 0 Months 23 Days | 12% | 43,90,761.00 | 46,08,721.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| P-5/ 20.01.2006 | 1,04,81,102/- | 11.04.2002 | 03 Years 9 Months 09 Days | 12% | 47,55,262.00 | 57,25,840.00 |
| | | | **Total** | | | **2,41,62,737.19** |
| | Average of sale deeds | | Rs. 2,41,62,737.19 ÷ 5 | | | **48,32,547.44** |
| | Net amount | | | | | **48,32,548 (Round Off)** |

15. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the acquisition in the present case(s) related to the public purpose namely, "*development and utilization of residential and commercial Sector 27, Rohtak*", respondent-State suffered loss towards optimum utilization of land and also incurred costs towards providing of additional infrastructural amenities like roads, parks green belts etc., thus, 40% deduction on account of development cost needs to be applied in the case(s) in hand. Accordingly, applying the same over the average base price per acre derived from the sale instances Ex. P-1 to P-5, the market value comes to Rs. 28,99,530/- (rounded off) [48,32,548 − 19,33,019.20 = 28,99,528.80].

16. Simultaneously, it may be noticed here that subsequent to the acquisition in the case(s) in hand, vide a notification dated 15.12.2006 issued under Section 4 of the Act, land forming part of the same revenue estate of Village Garhi Bohar was acquired (hereinafter referred to as "***the subsequent acquisition***"). The comparative details of the two acquisitions are encapsulated in a tabulated form hereunder:-

| **Details** | **Present Acquisition** | **Subsequent Acquisition** |
|---|---|---|
| **Section 4** | 11.04.2002 | 15.12.2006 |
| **Section 6** | 08.04.2003 | 14.12.2007 |
| **Revenue Estate of Village(s) involved** | Garhi Bohar | Garhi Bohar |
| **Public Purpose** | Development and utilization of residential and commercial Sector 27, Rohtak. | Development of Sector 26, Rohtak for residential / transport / commercial, recreational and communication purposes. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Award passed by the LAC** | Rs.12,50,000/- per acre vide Award dated 06.04.2005. | Rs. 20,00,000/- per acre vide Award dated 03.07.2009 |
| **Award passed by the Reference Court** | Dismissed vide Award dated 05.12.2018 upholding Rs.12,50,000/- per acre. | At uniform rate of Rs.24,86,998.10/- per acre vide Award dated 21.01.2014. |
| **Determination by this Court in RFA-1537-2016 (O&M) in Smt. Chander's Case** | ----- | Vide decision dated 16.03.2022, landowners were awarded uniform market value @ Rs.42,51,000/- per acre. |

16.1. A perusal of the above chart shows that for the land acquired in the same revenue estate of Village Garhi Bohar for the public purpose, namely, "*for development of Sector 26 for residential / transport / commercial, recreational and communication purposes*" vide notification dated 15.12.2006 under Section 4 of the Act, this Court vide order dated 16.03.2022 passed in ***Smt. Chander's case*** (supra) assessed the market value @ Rs.42,51,000/- per acre. If the principle of de-escalation @ 12% per annum is applied to the market value assessed by this Court in ***Smt. Chander's case*** (supra) for the time gap between two notifications i.e. 15.12.2006 (the subsequent acquisition) to 11.04.2002 (the present acquisition), the market value comes to Rs.18,70,000/- per acre (approximately).

16.2. At this juncture, it may be noticed here that the market value assessed by placing reliance upon the base price per acre derived from the sale instances produced by the appellants/landowners after applying de-escalation thereon, followed by taking the average of the price per acre and subsequently applying a deduction of 40% towards development cost (Rs. 28,99,530/-), is significantly higher than the price per acre obtained by applying de-escalation to the valuation determined by this Court for the period between the two acquisitions (Rs.18,70,000/-). Such increase in price can be attributed to the fact that the present acquisition undertaken for the purpose of "*development and utilization of residential and commercial Sector 27, Rohtak*", significantly enhanced the locational and potential value of the land forming part of the revenue estate of village Garhi Bohar, thereby, resulting in exponential rise in prices in the surrounding area within a short span of time, as clearly reflected from the sale instances produced by the appellants-landowners in the form of Exs.P-1 to P-5. Thus, even after applying the principle of de-escalation, in the humble opinion of this Court, the value assessed relying upon the sale instances produced by the appellants-landowners do not reflect the fair market value prevailing at the time of acquisition in the case(s) in hand. Rather, the valuation determined by this Court in ***Smt. Chander's case*** *(supra)* provides a more appropriate benchmark for arriving at the fair and reasonable market value.

17. In such circumstances, it may neither be safe nor equitable to place reliance upon the calculation made on the basis of the sale instances Exs.P-1 to P-5 especially in comparison to the assessment made by this Court by applying the principle of de-escalation to its earlier determination made with respect to the subsequent notification dated 15.12.2006. As such, the market value of the acquired land in relation to the present acquisition proceedings which commenced vide earlier notification dated 11.04.2002 under Section 4 of the Act, pertaining to the same revenue estate of Village Garhi Bohar, is re-assessed @ **Rs.18,70,000/- per acre**.

18. Besides it, the landowners-appellants shall also be entitled for all the statutory benefits and interest under the Act, especially the interest on solatium.

19. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, the present appeal(s) are disposed of with the aforesaid modification.

20. Wherever the landowner(s) has/have unfortunately expired in the appeal(s)/cross-objection(s) after filing thereof and the legal heirs have not been impleaded, they shall be at liberty to seek execution of the present decision by moving appropriate applications before the learned Executing Court.

21. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**10.04.2026** **(HARKESH MANUJA)**
Tejwinder **JUDGE**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Whether speaking/reasoned* | *Yes/No* |
| *Whether reportable* | *Yes/No* |

| **Other connected cases** |
|---|
| RFA-2208-2019 |
| RFA-2073-2019 |
| RFA-2074-2019 |
| RFA-2075-2019 |
| RFA-2076-2019 |
| RFA-2204-2019 |
| RFA-2205-2019 |
| RFA-2206-2019 |
| RFA-2207-2019 |
| RFA-1240-2019 |
| RFA-2209-2019 |
| RFA-2235-2019 |
| RFA-2289-2019 |
| RFA-746-2022 |