



171

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

**RFA No. 963 of 2024 (O&M)  
and “18” connected cases  
Date of Decision: 21.01.2026**

Smt. Raj Dulari

...Appellant

**Versus**

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate  
for the appellant(s).

Mr. Abhinash Jain, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana  
for respondent Nos. 1 & 2.

Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate with  
Ms. Surbhi Rana, Advocate  
for respondent Nos. 3 & 4-HSIIDC.

\*\*\*\*

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

This order shall dispose off present nineteen (19) appeals bearing RFA Nos. 963, 964, 967, 969, 981, 982, 1060, 1061, 1083, 1088, 1099, 1090, 1103, 1108, 1111, 1115, 1122, 1125 & 1156 of 2024, as the same arise out of common acquisition / award.

**Application(s) under Order 41 Rule 27 CPC filed on behalf of the appellant(s)-landowner(s) seeking permission to lead additional evidence in all cases.**

In these appeals, the appellant(s)-landowner(s) seek permission to lead additional evidence by placing on record some relevant document(s), viz. photocopy of the receipt / dispatch register of the Office of Land Acquisition Collector to show that the

reference(s) were filed within limitation. Pertinently, the copy of receipt placed on record has even been signed by the DRO-cum-LAC in original.

Upon notice(s), in one of the appeals bearing RFA No. 963 of 2024, reply dated 10.12.2025 has been filed on behalf of respondent-HSIIDC, which is taken on record.

Upon perusal of the aforesaid reply, the authenticity or validity of receipt-despatch register has not been disputed or denied by the respondent(s). Taking into account the findings recorded by the learned Reference Court wherein the claim of the appellant(s)-landowner(s) has been denied being barred by limitation, the document sought to be produced is very much required for the complete and effective adjudication of the appeal(s) in hand. It would help the Court to decide the rights of the parties in an effective manner; otherwise also, the document sought to be produced is from the records of the respondent(s) only which they suppressed before the learned Reference Court.

Consequently, the instant application(s) seeking permission to lead additional evidence are **allowed**. The copy of the certificate(s) of the Land Acquisition Collector annexed as Annexure A-1 reflecting the date of preferring the Reference(s) by the appellant(s) is/are ordered to taken on record as Exhibit X-1.

Registry to do the needful.

**Delay Application(s) in all cases**

Upon notice, in one of the appeals bearing RFA No. 963 of 2024, reply dated 10.12.2025 filed on behalf of the respondent(s)-HSIIDC is taken on record, wherein it is prayed that the present

application(s) are liable to be dismissed as the appeal(s) in hand are not maintainable.

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

As a matter of fact, on the reference petition(s) preferred at the instance of appellant(s)-landowner(s), previously an award passed by the learned Reference Court was challenged before this Court by way of RFA No. 10773 of 2014 (i.e. in lead case herein bearing RFA-963-2024) as well as in other connected cases by way of respective RFAs as the case may be; however, these RFAs were withdrawn by the appellant(s)-landowner(s) vide order dated 22.08.2016 (in lead case) and in other cases as the case may be, with liberty to move Review Application before the learned Reference Court. Thereafter, the reference petition(s) preferred by the appellant(s)-landowner(s) have again been dismissed being barred by limitation without appreciating the receipt/records maintained by the office of DRO-cum-LAC, Rohtak about filing of objections by the appellant(s)-landowner(s) under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. No receipt dated 10.08.2011, as referred to in the impugned award, has been placed on record by the respondents.

On the other hand, the document taken on record in the form of additional evidence as Exhibit X-1 has neither been referred to nor dealt with by the learned Reference Court.

In such circumstances, there being no delay on the part of the applicant(s)-appellant(s)/landowner(s) while preferring objections under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, which as per Exhibit X-1 were within time, the present appeal(s) preferred at

the instance of applicant(s)-appellant(s) was not to be held being barred by limitation, especially when they were diligently pursuing their remedies. In fact, it is the learned Reference Court which, on account of the oversight, failed to take into consideration the correct records of receipts of reference petition(s)-objections filed under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and thus, the delay was not to be attributed to the applicant(s)-appellant(s)/landowner(s) by putting them to any disadvantageous position.

Moreover, no evidence was led by the respondents so as to establish that any notice under Section 12 (2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was ever served upon the appellant(s)-landowner(s) or any copy of the award passed under Section 11 thereof was forwarded to them. Even no evidence was brought on record by the respondents to show that the amount of compensation assessed under the award passed by the LAC was disbursed to the appellant(s)-landowner(s) before the filing of reference petition(s).

Concededly, the other similarly situated landowners pertaining to the same acquisition proceedings have already been held entitled for the enhanced amount of compensation pertaining to the acquired land falling in the same revenue estate, i.e. ***Village Garhi Bohar, District Rohtak***, in view of judgment/order dated 14.11.2022 passed by this Court in a bunch of appeals, lead case of which was ***RFA-10335-2014***, titled ***“Malho and others Versus State of Haryana and others”***.

Based thereupon and applying the principle of parity, besides grant of just and fair compensation, the

landowners/applicants being similarly situated are held entitled for grant of similar amount of compensation.

In view of the discussion made hereinabove as well as from the contents of the application(s), the prayer is **allowed** and delay in filing the present appeal(s), as mentioned above, is hereby condoned. However, the applicant(s) shall be entitled for interest for the period of delay in filing the appeal as well; as in the present case, admittedly, the applicant(s)-appellant(s) were not responsible for any delay and were even continuously pursuing their claim through different proceedings.

**MAIN APPEAL(S)**

At the outset, learned counsel for the appellant(s) has stated at the Bar that in all these appeals, the land of appellant(s) has been wrongly mentioned in **Village Bohar** in the ground of appeal(s), whereas it pertains to **Village Garhi Bohar**, thus, submits that in the present set of cases, the land of appellant(s)-landowner(s) be now read as “situated in Village-Garhi Bohar” instead of “Village-Bohar”.

**[2]** Ordered accordingly.

**[3]** Learned counsel for the appellant(s) submits that the present appeals are squarely covered by the judgment dated 14.11.2022 passed by this Court in a bunch of appeals, lead case of which was ***RFA-10335-2014***, titled ***“Malho and others Versus State of Haryana and others”***.

**[4]** Learned counsel(s) for the respondent(s) are not in a position to controvert the above factual position.

[5] After going through the judgment referred to above as well as the present case, this Court agrees with the assertion of the learned counsel for the appellant(s).

[6] Consequently, the present appeal(s) are **disposed off** in the same terms as *Malho’s case (supra)*.

[7] Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand(s) disposed off.

**January 21, 2026**  
*‘dk kamra’*

**( HARKESH MANUJA )**  
**JUDGE**

|                               |     |    |
|-------------------------------|-----|----|
| Whether Speaking / Reasoned : | Yes | No |
| Whether Reportable :          | Yes | No |