



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

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

136

RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with
Cross-Objection No.116-CI of 2017 (O&M)
along with other connected cases

Date of Decision: 18.02.2026

**GREATER MOHALI AREA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (GMADA),
THROUGH ITS ESTATE OFFICER**

.....Appellant

Vs

ARMINDERJIT KAUR AND ANR.

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Advocate for the appellant(s)/GMADA.

Mr. Athar Ahmed, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Naresh Kaushal, Advocate and Mr. Nitish Kaushal, Advocate
for the cross-objector(s)/landowner(s)/respondent(s).

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)

CM No.546-CI & 547-CI of 2023 in RFA No.3096 of 2017

By way of present application(s) filed under Order 41 Rule 27 Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (for short 'CPC') read with Section 151 CPC, a prayer has been made for producing certain documents on record in the form of sale deeds and site plans etc. as Annexures A-1 to A-22, by way of additional evidence and seeking exemption from filing certified copies/true typed copies thereof.

In pursuance to the notice of the application on 28.02.2023, today reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent(s)/landowner(s), the same is taken on record.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the contents of the application.

**RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases**

A perusal of the records shows that the sale instances sought to be produced by way of additional evidence as Annexure A-3 to A-20 are all photostat copies and thus, cannot be permitted to be produced in additional evidence. Even no effort has been made by the applicant/appellant to place on record the certified copies of such sale instances so as to draw benefit in terms of Section 51-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. Besides it, the other documents sought to be produced are minutes of meeting of the District Price Fixation Committee (Annexure A-1), Site plans (Annexure A-2 & A-21), whereas the document Annexure A-22 is the master plan of New Chandigarh.

The document Annexure A-1 has no relevance at this stage as the same only relates to the proceedings of the District Level Price Fixation Committee which has already been admitted in the Award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector in exercise of the statutory power vested in it under Section 11 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. Furthermore, once the master plan of New Chandigarh is already on record, the evidence in the form of Annexure A-22 and site plan (Annexure A-2 & A-21) would not be essential for the purpose of adjudication of the case(s) in hand. Even otherwise, no reason has been given by the applicant-appellant as to why the documents were not proved on record before the learned Reference Court.

In view of above, the applications preferred at the instance of the applicant-appellant being devoid of merits are, thus dismissed.

Main Appeal(s)

[1]. Vide this common order, a bunch of 64 Regular First Appeals along with Cross-objections, details of which are given in the footnote of this judgment, are being decided as all the cases have arisen out of common acquisition/Award



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

involving identical facts and question of law. For the sake of brevity, facts are being taken from RFA No.3096 of 2017 and Cross-Objection No.116-CI of 2017.

[2]. By way of present appeal(s), challenge has been laid to the Award dated 14.02.2017 passed by the learned Addl. District Judge, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) (hereinafter to be referred as the 'Reference Court').

[3]. Briefly stating, in the present case(s), total land measuring 335.3998 acres situated within the revenue estates of villages Hoshiarpur, Majra and Takipur was acquired vide Notifications dated 17.05.2013 and 10.09.2013 issued under Sections 4 & 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short the '1894 Act') respectively, for the public purpose, namely "for setting up Residential Urban Estate Phase-II, in the area of Mullanpur, Tehsil Kharar, District S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali)". Award under Section 11 of the 1894 Act was passed by the Land Acquisition Collector (for short 'the LAC') on 31.12.2013, thereby determining the market value of the acquired land at the uniform rate of Rs.1,36,00,000/- per acre besides award of all other statutory benefits and interests provided under the 1894 Act.

[4]. Dis-satisfied with the LAC Award, respondent(s)/landowner(s) invoked Reference under Section 18 of the 1894 Act, which came to be partly allowed by the learned Reference Court on 14.02.2017, granting enhanced compensation at uniform rate of Rs.3,86,86,925/- per acre besides awarding all other statutory benefits/interest under the 1894 Act.

[5]. Aggrieved thereof, the present appeal(s) were preferred at the instance of appellant(s)/GMADA whereas, cross-objections were filed by the respondent(s)/landowner(s).

[6]. Impugning the aforesaid Award, learned Senior counsel representing the appellant(s)/GMADA submits that the learned Reference Court erroneously



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

based its determination upon the sale instance dated 14.12.2007 (Ex.P-3) and consequently granted enhancement of market value to the tune of Rs.3,86,86,925/- per acre in favour of the respondent(s)/landowner(s) by applying cumulative appreciation @ 12% per annum upon the base price @ Rs.2,88,00,000/- per acre derived from the said sale instance dated 14.12.2007(Ex.P-3) for the time gap between the date of sale deed i.e. 14.12.2007 till the date of Notification issued under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, i.e. 17.05.2013 in the present case(s).

[6.1]. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the sale exemplar dated 14.12.2007 (Ex.P-3) pertained to the revenue estate of village Parol, whereas the acquisition in the case(s) in hand pertained to the different revenue estates of villages Hoshiarpur, Majra and Takipur, Tehsil Kharar, District S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali). He thus, submits that rather than relying upon the sale exemplar (Ex.P-3), the learned Reference Court ought to have relied upon the sale deed dated 08.06.2011 (Ex.R- 4) produced by the appellant(s)/authority as the same related to the revenue estate of village Takipur which was even part of the acquired land.

[6.2]. Learned Senior counsel also points out that though an appropriate deduction of 30% was applied by the learned Reference Court upon the base price per acre derived from the sale instance dated 14.12.2007 (Ex.P-3), however, in the given facts, wherein the land parcel thereunder did not pertain to the same revenue estate, a cumulative deduction of atleast 50% was required to be applied towards smallness of area and the development cost(s).

[6.3]. Learned Senior counsel further contends that the learned Reference Court erred having made the assessment by relying upon the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short the '2013 Act'). Learned Senior counsel submits

**RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases**

that once the Award in the present case was passed on 30.12.2013 by the Land Acquisition Collector in exercise of its power under Section 11 of the 1894 Act, the provisions of 2013 Act were not applicable and the assessment of compensation was to be made under the provisions of 1894 Act. He thus, submits that no enhancement was required to be awarded in favour of the respondent(s)/landowner(s) and as such the impugned judgment was liable to be set aside and the Award passed by the LAC was required to be restored.

[7]. Learned counsel for the respondent(s)/landowner(s) alternatively submits that the learned Reference Court rightly relied upon the previously passed Reference Court Award dated 10.10.2013 (Ex.P-4) pertaining to the acquisition which commenced vide notification dated 20.02.2009 issued under Section 4 of the 1894 Act. He also points out that the determination vide Ex.P-4 also pertained to the revenue estate of village Hoshiarpur, which was majorly involved in the acquisition in hand. Learned counsel, further submits that the respondent(s)/landowner(s) were entitled for award of appreciation @ 15% for the time gap between the two notifications issued under Section 4 of the 1894 Act i.e. 20.02.2009 (previous acquisition) and 17.05.2013 (the current acquisition) over the determination made vide previous Reference Court Award dated 10.10.2013 (Ex.P-4).

[7.1]. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the respondent(s)/landowner(s) that in the facts and circumstances of the present case(s) wherein the acquired land was surrounded by residential and commercial establishments with all basic necessary amenities already available at the site, no deduction towards development cost(s) was required to be applied. Learned counsel, thus submits that the market value of the acquired land was required to be re-assessed and enhanced in favour of the respondent(s)/landowner(s). Pertinently,



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

no specific submission was made with respect to the determination of enhancement of market value in terms of the provisions of 2013 Act.

[8]. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book as well as records of the case(s). I find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the respondent(s)/landowner(s).

[9]. A perusal of the record shows that in the present case, the acquisition commenced vide notification dated 17.05.2013 for 335.3998 acres of land involving three revenue estates of villages Hoshiarpur, Majra and Takipur, Tehsil Kharar, District S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) for the public purpose namely, for setting up residential Urban Estate Phase-II, in the area of Mullanpur, Tehsil Kharar, District S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali). Admittedly, prior thereto, vide notification dated 20.02.2009 issued under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, the land parcel forming part of village Hoshiapur, in addition to four other revenue estates was acquired for the public purpose namely for construction of road from Mullanpur Garibdass to Kurali-Siswan T-Junction; called HR-2 road (Horizontal Road). For convenience, a comparative chart of the minimum details pertaining to the two acquisitions are given below:-

Previous Acquisition		Present Acquisition
Section 4	20.02.2009	17.05.2013
Section 6	10.08.2009	10.09.2013
Revenue Estates of villages involved	Mullanpur Garibdass, Ferozpur, Parol, Hoshiarpur and Majra	Hoshiarpur, Majra and Takipur
Award passed by the LAC	Mullanpur Garibdass Rs.1,45,00,000/-, Ferozpur and Parol Rs.1,31,00,000/-, Hoshiarpur Rs.1,35,00,000/- and Majra Rs.1,29,00,000/- per acre vide Award dated	Rs.1,36,00,000/- per acre vide Award dated 30.12.2013



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

	31.03.2010	
Award passed by the Reference Court	At uniform rate of Rs.2,32,00,000/- per acre vide Award dated 22.07.2013	At uniform rate of Rs.3,86,86,925/- per acre vide Award dated 14.02.2017
Determination by this Court in RFA No.7762 of 2013 with Cross-Objection No.98-CI of 2018	Vide decision dated 27.01.2026, landowners were awarded uniform market value @ Rs.3,38,40,000/- per acre.	<i>Sub-judice</i> in present Appeals-Cross-objections.

[10]. The above chart, clearly reflects that with respect to the revenue estate of village Hoshiarpur, the market value already stands assessed by this Court @ Rs.3,38,40,000/- per acre as on the date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act issued on 20.02.2009 in relation to the previous acquisition proceedings, vide order dated 27.01.2026 passed in *RFA No.7762 of 2013 with Cross-Objection No.98-CI of 2018* titled ‘*The Greater Mohali Area Development Authority, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) Vs. Baldev Singh (Deceased) through his LRs and Ors.*’

[11]. In the humble opinion of this Court, no merit can be found in the submission made on behalf of the appellant(s)/authority that reliance ought to have been placed upon the sale deed dated 08.06.2011 (Ex.R- 4) pertaining to the revenue estate of village Takipur vide which land measuring 11 Marlas was sold @ Rs.3.20 crore per acre, particularly when over 98% of the acquired land falls within the revenue estate of village Hoshiarpur and the acquisition from the revenue estate of village Takipur constitutes less than 2% of the total acquired land. In such circumstances, the sale exemplar dated 08.06.2011 (Ex.R-4) pertaining to village Takipur was not to be taken into account for determination of market value of the acquired land being not reflective of the representative value of the complete chunk. Thus, in the circumstances, wherein out of total land of



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

335.3998 acres, acquisition from the revenue estate of village Hoshiarpur pertains to 329.456 acres of land which constitutes more than 98% of the total acquired land, the determination with respect to the revenue estate of village Hoshiarpur, already been made by this Court vide decision dated 27.01.2026 passed in **RFA No.7762 of 2013 with Cross-Objection No.98-CI of 2018**, needs to be treated as the best piece of evidence for the purpose of determination of market value herein.

[12]. Furthermore, from the evidence available on record in the form of Master Plan of New Chandigarh site plan (Ex.P-5), it is evident that the revenue estate of village Hoshiarpur is located on the HR-2 Road (Horizontal Road) and is just adjacent to the other residential and commercial area in the close vicinity, developed by the private Colonizers namely, Omaxe and Altus. Besides it, the revenue estates of villages Hoshiarpur and Takipur are abutting and adjoining each other, thus carrying uniform locational and potential advantage. Importantly, under the previous acquisition the carving out of HR-2 Road leading from Mullanpur Garibdass to Kurali-Siwan T-Junction which also abuts the revenue estate of village Hoshiarpur has gone on to add substantially to the potential value of the present acquired chunk. Major portion of Eco City-II is infact located exactly on the said road.

[12.1]. Thus, taking into account the locational and potential value attached to the acquired land in the present case(s), for the time gap between the two notifications dated 20.02.2009 and 17.05.2013 which is 04 years and 03 months, an appreciation @ 15% per annum needs to be awarded on the market value assessed (Rs.3,38,40,000/- per acre) which comes to Rs.5,54,13,000/- per acre. The reliance with respect to the percentage of appreciation @ 15 percent is placed upon the case of *Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti Sahaswan Dist. Badaun Thr. Its Secretary vs.*



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

Bipin Kumar & Another, Etc, 2004 (2) SCC 283. Relevant paragraph No.8 in this regard is reproduced hereunder:-

“8. However there is evidence of high potentiality. The increase of 15% given by the High Court cannot therefore be said to be unreasonable. Of course, the 15% increase has to be on Rs.15.40 which is the figure shown in the sale deed. It cannot be on Rs.120 as wrongly taken by the High Court. The High Court also erred in considering only three years increase whereas in fact there is four years difference between the respondent's sale deed and the acquisition proceedings. Thus taking an increase of 60% over the price of Rs.15.40 per sq. yard the value comes to Rs.24.64 per sq. yard. We accordingly set aside the order of the Reference Court and the High Court and fix value at the rate of Rs.24.64 per sq. yard. The respondent will also to be entitled to solatium and other statutory benefits under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.”

[13]. Insofar as the deductions on account of development cut and the extent thereof are concerned, the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Sajan v. State of Maharashtra* reported as *2020(14) SCC 139* has reaffirmed that the if the valuation of a large extent of agricultural or undeveloped land is to be based on the sale price of a small developed plot in a private layout, then the percentage of deduction may however vary between 20% to 75% depending on several circumstances. The relevant paragraph No. 16 is reproduced hereunder:-

“16. Rule of one-third deduction towards development is the general rule. But depending upon the purpose of acquisition and taking note of well planned layouts, if any, the deduction for development cost may vary from 20% to 75%. Observing that deduction towards development can range from 20% to 75% of the price of the plot, in Lal Chand v. Union of India and Another (2009) 15 SCC 769, the Supreme Court held as under:-

"19. If the acquired land is in a semi-developed urban area, and not an undeveloped rural area, then the deduction for development may be as much less, that is, as little as 25% to 40%, as some basic



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

infrastructure will already be available. (Note: The percentages mentioned above are tentative standards and subject to proof to the contrary.)

.....

22. Some of the layouts formed by the statutory development authorities may have large areas earmarked for water/sewage treatment plants, water tanks, electrical substations, etc. in addition to the usual areas earmarked for roads, drains, parks, playgrounds and community/civic amenities. The purpose of the aforesaid examples is only to show that the "deduction for development" factor is a variable percentage and the range of percentage itself being very wide from 20% to 75%."

[13.1]. Also, in *Kasturi v. State of Haryana*, reported as *2003(1) SCC 354*, it was observed that in cases of land acquisition where there are certain advantages by virtue of the developed area around, it may help in reducing the percentage of cut to be applied, as the development charges required maybe less on that account. There may be various factual factors which may have to be taken into consideration while applying the cut in payment of compensation towards development charges, maybe in some cases it is more than 1/3rd and in some cases less than 1/3rd. Therefore, taking into consideration the potential of the acquired land for the construction of residential and commercial buildings, a deduction of only 20% was applied. The relevant portions of the paragraphs are extracted hereunder:-

"5. The emphasis and thrust of the argument made on behalf of the appellants was that the cut of 20% on the amount of compensation was not at all justified having regard to the fact that the acquired land was in a fully developed area.

6. The learned Single Judge, dealing with the question of location and potentiality of the acquired land, has observed that there is really not much dispute between the parties in that regard; documents clearly show that the



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

land in question is adjacent to the land already acquired for developing Sectors 13 and 23; on one side of the acquired land, there is a city railway station while on the other, there is 100 ft. wide road; there is overwhelming documentary evidence to show that the land in question is surrounded by developed areas and the land has a commercial and residential potentiality.

.....

However, in cases of some land where there are certain advantages by virtue of the developed area around, may help in deducting the percentage of cut to be applied, as the developmental charges required may be less on that account. There may be various factual factors which may have to be taken into consideration while applying the cut in payment of compensation towards development charges, may be in some cases it is more than $\frac{1}{3}$ and in some cases less than $\frac{1}{3}$. It must be remembered that there is difference between a developed area and an area having potential value, which is yet to be developed. The fact that an area is developed or adjacent to a developed area will not ipso facto make every land situated in the area also developed to be valued as a building site or plot, particularly when vast tracts are acquired, as in this case, for development purpose.

.....

14. On facts and in the light of the legal position emerging from the various decisions referred to above, it is not possible for us to say that cut of 20% adopted by the learned Single Judge as affirmed by the Division Bench in the impugned judgment is wrong or unsustainable. It appears to us having regard to facts and circumstances of the case that the High Court has applied cut of 20% as against the normal $\frac{1}{3}$ deduction. We find that the High Court was right and justified in doing so."

[13.2]. From the discussion made hereinabove, and taking into account the fact that the acquisition in the present case has been carried out for the public purpose of setting up Residential Urban Estate Phase-II, in the area of Mullanpur, Tehsil Kharar, District S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali), a suitable development cut needs to be applied towards the expenditure incurred by the appellant-authority for providing all basic infrastructural amenities to the allottees. However, keeping in



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

view the fact that the acquired land is situated in the close vicinity of Union Territory of Chandigarh and is geographically located on the HR-2 Road (Horizontal Road) leading from Mullanpur Garibdass to Kurali-Siswan T-Junction with already developed surroundings at the hands of private Colonizers namely Omaxe and Altus etc. thereby, carrying all basic infrastructural civic amenities in the area, in the humble opinion of this Court, a suitable deduction @ 25% over the base price of Rs.5,54,13,000/- per acre would suffice as against the development cost(s). The market value with respect to the acquired land, thus comes to Rs.4,15,59,750/- per acre as on the date of issuance of notification under section 4 of the 1894 Act dated 17.05.2003.

[14]. It may be noticed here that though before the learned Reference Court, the argument raised on behalf of the respondent(s)/landowner(s) that the determination of market value was required to be done under the provisions of 2013 Act, however in the present appeals/cross-objections, no such argument was raised on behalf of the respondent(s)/landowner(s), thus the same needs no adjudication/determination.

[15]. Accordingly, the market value for the land acquired in all the three villages is re-assessed @ Rs.4,15,59,750/-per acre. In addition, the landowners shall also be entitled for award of all statutory benefits and interest as provided under the provisions of the 1894 Act (amended upto date). The landowners shall also be entitled for solatium @ 30% besides award of interest thereupon.

[16]. Consequently, in view of the discussion made herein above, the appeals preferred at the instance of appellant(s)-GMADA are hereby dismissed and the cross-objections filed by the landowners are partly allowed in the aforesaid terms.



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

[17]. 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 application(s) before the learned Executing Court.

[18]. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

February 18, 2026
Atik

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

Sr. No	Case Number	Sr. No.	Case Number
1	RFA No.3536 of 2017 (O&M) with XOBJR-115-CI-2017 (O&M)	2	RFA No.2265 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-104-2019 (O&M)
3	RFA No.729 of 2020 (O&M)	4	RFA No.2266 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-109-2019 (O&M)
5	RFA No.730 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-19-2022 (O&M)	6	RFA No.2267 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-113-2019 (O&M)
7	RFA No.731 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-79-2023 (O&M)	8	RFA No.2268 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-142-2019 (O&M)
9	RFA No.732 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-85-2023 (O&M)	10	RFA No.2269 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-123-2019 (O&M)
11	RFA No.733 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-1-2022 (O&M)	12	RFA No.2270 of 2019 (O&M)
13	RFA No.734 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-92-2023 (O&M)	14	RFA No.2271 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-153-2019 (O&M)
15	RFA No.735 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-63-2022 (O&M)	16	RFA No.2272 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-67-2019 (O&M)
17	RFA No.736 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-22-2022 (O&M)	18	RFA No.2273 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-4-2020 (O&M)
19	RFA No.737 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-17-2024 (O&M)	20	RFA No.2274 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-133-2019 (O&M)
21	RFA No.738 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-167-2021 (O&M)	22	RFA No.2522 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-25-2020 (O&M)
23	RFA No.739 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-1-2023 (O&M)	24	RFA No.2523 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-97-2021 (O&M)
25	RFA No.740 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-11-2022 (O&M)	26	RFA No.2524 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-111-2019 (O&M)
27	RFA No.741 of 2020 (O&M)	28	RFA No.2525 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-28-2020 (O&M)
29	RFA No.742 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-8-2022 (O&M)	30	RFA No.2526 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-114-2019 (O&M)



RFA No.3096 of 2017 (O&M) with other connected cases

31	RFA No.743 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-17-2022 (O&M)	32	RFA No.2527 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-110-2019 (O&M)
33	RFA No.744 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-78-2022 (O&M)	34	RFA No.2528 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-101-2019 (O&M)
35	RFA No.745 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-4-2022 (O&M)	36	RFA No.2529 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-119-2019 (O&M)
37	RFA No.746 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-9-2022 (O&M)	38	RFA No.2530 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-120-2019 (O&M)
39	RFA No.747 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-6-2022 (O&M)	40	RFA No.2531 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-108-2019 (O&M)
41	RFA No.748 of 2020 (O&M)	42	RFA No.2532 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-100-2019 (O&M)
43	RFA No.749 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-2-2023 (O&M)	44	RFA No.2533 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-128-2019 (O&M)
45	RFA No.750 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-2-2022 (O&M)	46	RFA No.2534 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-5-2020 (O&M)
47	RFA No.610 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-65-2022 (O&M)	48	RFA No.2535 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-20-2021 (O&M)
49	RFA No.865 of 2020 (O&M) with XOBJR-64-2022 (O&M)	50	RFA No.2536 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-140-2019 (O&M)
51	RFA No.2255 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-103-2019 (O&M)	52	RFA No.2603 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-115-2019 (O&M)
53	RFA No.2256 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-102-2019 (O&M)	54	RFA No.2604 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-8-2020 (O&M)
55	RFA No.2257 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-125-2019 (O&M)	56	RFA No.2605 of 2019 (O&M) with XOBJR-112-2019 (O&M)
57	RFA No.2258 of 2019 (O&M) With XOBJR-122-2019 (O&M)	58	RFA No.2259 of 2019 (O&M)
59	RFA No.2260 of 2019 (O&M) With XOBJR-145-2019 (O&M)	60	RFA No.2261 of 2019 (O&M) With XOBJR-54-2021 (O&M)
61	RFA No.2262 of 2019 (O&M) With XOBJR-121-2019 (O&M)	62	RFA No.2263 of 2019 (O&M)
63	RFA No.2264 of 2019 (O&M) With XOBJR-27-2020 (O&M)		

February 18, 2026
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE