

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**  
**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2903 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)Nos.19910/2019)**

**BANWARI LAL & ANR.**

**APPELLANT(S)**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.**

**RESPONDENT(S)**

**WITH**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3897-3913 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9911-9927/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 12853/2019)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3264-3273 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9249-9258/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 41829/2019)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3148-3149 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9118-9119/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 37361/2018)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3292-3296 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9278-9282/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 27545/2018)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3922-3927 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9937-9942/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 12649/2019)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3946-3953 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9961-9968/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 12798/2019)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3954-3973 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9969-9988/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 13004/2019)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3974-4008 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9990-10024/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 13012/2019)**

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4406-4418 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10437-10449/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 13014/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4009-4037 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10025-10053/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 13611/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4038-4054 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10054-10070/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 13637/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4072-4089 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10088-10105/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 13823/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4093-4144 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10109-10160/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14039/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4145-4197 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10166-10218/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14125/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4207-4215 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10228-10236/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14127/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4228-4278 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10252-10302/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14322/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4290-4304 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10315-10329/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14471/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4305-4332 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10333-10360/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14488/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4333-4365 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10361-10393/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14775/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4062-4071 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10078-10087/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 20010/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4090-4092 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10106-10108/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 22211/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2907 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 20572/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2905 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 20424/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2904 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 20107/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2906 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 20435/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2908 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 20970/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3500-3516 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s).9508-9524/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 31052/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3517-3533 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s).9525-9541/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 31280/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2937-2940 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 22745-22748/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2941-2942 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 23158-23159/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2953-2957 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 24031-24035/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2990 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 26330/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2959-2979 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 24193-24213/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2951-2952 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 23397-23398/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2912-2936 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 22510-22534/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2958 OF 2021

(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 24121/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2980 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 24235/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3893-3896 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9907-9910/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 32137/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3944-3945 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9959-9960/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 32140/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3931-3943 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9946-9958/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 32143/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2943-2950 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 23365-23372/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2909-2911 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 21741-21743/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3919-3921 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9934-9936/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 32929/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3914-3915 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9928-9929/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 34022/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3877-3878 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9890-9891/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 34035/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3879-3881 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9893-9895/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 34036/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3882-3892 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9896-9906/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 34072/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3917-3918 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9932-9933/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 34169/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3677-3709 OF 2021

(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9689-9721/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 35153/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2988 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 26266/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2991-2994 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 26551-26554/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3675-3676 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9687-9688/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 35650/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3674 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9686/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 35845/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2987 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 25656/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2981 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 24860/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2982 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 25273/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3673 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9684/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 36146/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3672 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9683/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 36151/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3671 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9682/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 36180/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2983-2986 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 25379-25382/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3663-3670 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9672-9679/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 36593/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4198-4206 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10219-10227/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 36886/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3710-3732 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9722-9744/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 37763/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3928-3930 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9943-9945/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 38083/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3869-3876 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9882-9889/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 39004/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3168-3173 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9153-9158/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 39672/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3260-3263 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9245-9248/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 39675/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3275-3279 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9260-9264/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 40191/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3280-3289 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9265-9274/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 41834/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3290-3291 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9275-9276/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 42089/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3206-3259 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9191-9244/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 42253/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2996 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 28737/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3303-3305 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9289-9291/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 43721/2019)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3174-3193 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9159-9178/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 48293/2018)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4366-4371 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10396-10401/2021)



(Arising from Diary No(s). 12610/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4372-4398 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10402-10428/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14338/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2997 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C) No(s). 3554/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3418 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9405/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 31450/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2998-3011 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 5211-5224/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2989 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 26329/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3086-3091 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 8007-8012/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3082-3085 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 7947-7950/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4216-4227 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10237-10248/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 36488/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4279-4287 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10303-10311/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 36590/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3746-3748 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9759-9761/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 37458/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3733-3745 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9745-9757/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 37678/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3204-3205 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9189-9190/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 40127/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).2995 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 28708/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3194-3203 OF 2021

(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9179-9188/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 42747/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3322-3324 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9309-9311/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 43727/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3319-3321 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9306-9308/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 45987/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3297-3302 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9283-9288/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 45992/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3306-3318 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9293-9305/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 45996/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3348-3357 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9335-9344/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 46761/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3336-3343 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9323-9330/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 46766/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3358-3360 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9345-9347/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 46818/2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3151-3156 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9121-9126/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 1893/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3157-3159 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9127-9129/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 1895/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3160 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9130/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 2869/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3012 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 6956/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3150 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9120/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 4421/2020)



**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3093-3133 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9059-9099/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 5798/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3017-3019 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 6992-6994/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3013-3016 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 6988-6991/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3020-3027 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 6995-7002/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3134-3147 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9102-9115/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 7907/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3043-3081 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 7018-7056/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3483-3499 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9491-9507/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 9213/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3462-3473 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9468-9479/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 9509/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3028-3042 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 7003-7017/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3474 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9481/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 10192/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3563-3580 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9571-9588/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 10446/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3439-3449 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9445-9455/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 10447/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3581-3590 OF 2021**  
 (Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9589-9598/2021)  
 (Arising from Diary No(s). 10448/2020)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3475-3482 OF 2021**

(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9482-9489/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 10556/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3450-3456 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9456-9462/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 10558/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3457-3461 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9463-9467/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 10563/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4399-4405 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10430-10436/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 11738/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3659-3662 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9668-9671/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 12731/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3534-3557 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9542-9565/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 14775/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3419-3438 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9406-9425/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 15741/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3601-3603 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9610-9612/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 16500/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4055-4061 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10071-10077/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 16505/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3598-3600 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9607-9609/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 16885/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3591-3597 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9599-9605/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 17016/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3325-3335 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9312-9322/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 20036/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3344-3347 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9331-9334/2021)

(Arising from Diary No(s). 20518/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3361-3408 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9348-9395/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 20628/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3558-3562 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9566-9570/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 22646/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3616-3658 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9625-9667/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 23862/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3604-3615 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9613-9624/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 24115/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4288-4289 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s)10312-10313/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 25364/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3415-3417 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9402-9404/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 25964/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3409-3414 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9396-9401/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 17003/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3749-3868 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9762-9881/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 20039/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3092 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s). 3747/2021)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3161 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9131/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 3505/2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3274 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9259/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 4835/2021)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3162-3167 OF 2021  
(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9132-9137/2021)  
(Arising from Diary No(s). 6196/2021)

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).3916 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).9931/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 19553/2020)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO(S).4419-4425 OF 2021**  
**(Arising from SLP(C)No(s).10557-10563/2021)**  
**(Arising from Diary No(s). 20102/2020)**

**O R D E R**

**08.07.2021**

Leave granted in all the petitions.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties in all the matters.

For the nature of issues raised and keeping in mind the settled legal principles, we deem it appropriate to segregate the consideration notification-wise and villages mentioned therein in seriatim.

**RE: FIRST NOTIFICATION DATED 01.05.2006**

**Village : Badoli**

The Land Acquisition Officer determined the market value of those lands at Rs.330.57 per sq.yd., which came to be enhanced by the Reference Court to Rs.585/- per sq.yd. The High Court in the impugned order has further enhanced it to Rs.1229/-

per sq.yd.

This opinion of the High Court has been assailed by the State of Haryana on the argument that the High Court has not discussed about the efficacy of the sale instances relied upon by the parties in its proper perspective. In that, at least, out of six relied upon sale instances, four sale instances pertain to the period in and around the date of notification and, admittedly, after the draft proposal for acquisition was under consideration of the competent authority. For that reason, the sale instances, Exhibits P-22, P-23, P-24 and P-25, need to be discarded because of the sudden spurt in price to the extent of 100% of the fair market price of the lands prevailing at the relevant time. Inasmuch as, the consistent market price of the land in Badoli in and around the time of first notification dated 01.05.2006, as seen from Exhibit P-58 and P-59, appears to be Rs.735/- per sq.yd. and Rs.806/- per sq.yd. respectively.

We find merits in this submission. Taking the best price noted in Exhibit P-59, the market price would, therefore, be Rs.806/- per sq.yd. Therefore, taking this as the base value at Rs.806/- per sq.yd., as per the settled legal

position, deductions need to be provided because the lands in question are admittedly large tract of agricultural and undeveloped lands.

After hearing the learned counsel for the respondents, we accede to the suggestion of deduction to the extent of 20%, from Rs.806/- per sq.yd. The fair market price or compensation amount would thus be worked out to Rs.645 (rounded off) per sq.yd. We order accordingly.

The High Court order, as regards the lands in Badoli village will bear compensation at the rate of Rs.645 (Rupees Six Hundred Forty Five) per sq.yd. Rest of the benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed.

Accordingly, the appeal(s) filed by the State against enhancement and cross appeal(s) filed by the claimant(s) for enhancement, both stand disposed of in the above terms.

#### Village Pehlادpur

As regards village Pehlادpur, identical factual position emerges as in the case of Village Badoli.

Even, in respect of this village around the



time first notification dated 01.05.2006 came to be issued, the consistent market price - as can be discerned from four sale instances - is around Rs.805.00 per sq.yd. The other two relied upon sale instances, i.e. Exhibits P-4 and P-15, do indicate the market price as Rs.2582/- sq.yd. and Rs.2479/- per sq.yd. respectively. However, these sale instances are for smaller plots (of only 14K 0M and 10K 6M.) dated 02.05.2006 and 16.05.2006 respectively, by which time the draft proposal for acquisition was already in place.

Accordingly, these two sale instances need to be discarded, which crucial aspect has been glossed over by the High Court.

It necessarily follows that the fair market price in respect of lands situated within village Pehladpur would be around Rs.805/- per sq.yd. Nevertheless, we are inclined to give the same amount of compensation as given in the case of Village Badoli, referred to above.

Mr. Ranbir Yadav, learned counsel appearing for the claimant(s), was at pains to point out that the highest price noted in Exhibit P-4 and P-15 be reckoned and after giving deduction, appropriate compensation amount can be worked out.

We find no merits in this submission, as in our view, the two sale instances need to be discarded.

Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, learned counsel appearing for the other set of claimant(s) submits that the lands in question are situated in developed area, inasmuch as the lands across the canal have already been developed. This argument does not commend to us. For, we would proceed on the basis of relied upon sale instances which have come on record during the reference proceedings. They represent the true market value on the date of the Section 4 notification.

As a result, the appeal(s) filed by the State challenging the enhancement given by the High Court as well as the cross appeal(s) filed by the claimant(s) for further enhancement, both are disposed of on the same terms as in the case of village Badoli concerning the first notification dated 01.05.2006. Rest of the benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed.

**Village : Bhatola**

As regards village Bhatola, referred to in

the first notification dated 01.05.2006, the situation is no different. Out of the sixteen sale instances, the market price in the first sale instance i.e. Exhibit P-15 is mentioned as Rs.805/- per sq.yd. The other sale instances i.e. Exhibits P-13, P-14, P8, P-16, P-17, P-5, P-6, P-9, P-4, P-11, P-2, P-10, P-3, P-11 and P-7, are around the time after the circulation of draft acquisition proposal and, naturally, there had been sudden spurt in the consideration amount. For that reason, as in the case of other two villages (Badoli and Pehladur), we discard the 15 relied upon sale instances, referred to above, and proceed only on the basis of sale instance Exhibited as P-15, which mentions the market price of the land at Rs.805/- per sq.yd. Accordingly, the compensation amount in respect of village Bhatola will also stand modified to Rs.645 (rounded off) per sq.yd., as in the earlier set of cases.

The appeal(s) filed by the State against enhancement of compensation amount by the High Court in respect of village Bhatola concerning notification dated 01.05.2006 stands modified to that extent only.

Hence, the appeal(s) filed by the State as

well as cross appeal(s) filed by the claimant(s) are disposed of in the above terms. Rest of the benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed.

Village : Murtzapur

As regards the land situated within the Village Murtzapur, the High Court has determined the enhanced compensation amount as in the case of other three villages (Badoli, Pehladpur and Bhatola), mentioned in the first notification dated 01.05.2006, being Rs.1229/- per sq.yd.

Reliance has been placed only on two sale instances i.e. Exhibit P-2 and P-12. The sale consideration mentioned therein is, no doubt, Rs.2892.60 and Rs.2272.70 per sq.yd. respectively, but these sale pertain to period after the issuance of notification on 01.05.2006. As in the case of other three villages referred to above, it is noticed that the market price mentioned therein is inflated after issuance of notice dated 01.05.2006, and which fact cannot be overlooked whilst determining the fair market price.

Further, Village Murtzapur, covered under the first notification dated 01.05.2006, is

situated in close proximity of villages Badoli, Pehladpur and Bhatola. The circle rate of villages Badoli and Pehladpur is similar and presumably for that reason, the Land Acquisition Officer as well as the Reference Court, including the High Court, deemed it proper to specify same compensation amount for all these villages.

Accordingly, to maintain consistency we deem it appropriate to give the same market price for villages in Murtzapur being Rs.645 (rounded off) per sq.yd., as determined in respect of stated villages covered under the same notification.

Mr. Somvir Singh Deswal, learned counsel for the claimant(s), has invited our attention to the compensation amount decided in the case of' *Mohan Lal and Ors. Vs. State of Haryana and Others* in R.F.A. No.2075/2012. This judgment will be of no consequence for dealing with the claim in respect of notification dated 01.05.2006. In other words, the said judgment pertains to different notification.

Accordingly, even in the case of lands situated within the village Murtzapur, the appeal(s) preferred by the State and the cross appeal(s) by the claimants stand disposed of by

specifying the market price at Rs.645 per sq.yd. with all other benefits, including statutory benefits, as awarded by the High Court.

Village : Sihi

Reverting to the lands situated within Village Sihi, Mr. Ranbir Singh Yadav, learned counsel for the claimant(s), relied upon four sale instances. These sale instances pertain to period in and around the date of first notification dated 01.05.2006, and there is sudden spurt in the market price.

The first sale instance, however, mentions the market price at Rs.1570/- per sq.yd., which sale deed is executed on 10.02.2006, but the other three sale instances, mention higher rate i.e. over Rs.2558/- per sq.yd. In other words, there is sudden spurt of market price indicated in the other three relied upon sale instances i.e., Exhibit P-13, P-12 and P-20, which, therefore, needs to be discarded.

That would mean that the claimant(s) would be entitled for fair market price commensurate with the sale consideration in Exhibit R-4, at of Rs.1351/- (Rupees One Thousand and Three Hundred



Fifty-One) per sq.yd., after providing for deductions.

The High Court, therefore, has determined the amount at Rs.1351/- per sq.yd. for lands in village Sihi. We are not disturbing that conclusion of the High Court.

Accordingly, the appeals filed by the State against enhancement of compensation amount by the High Court stands rejected and cross appeal(s) filed by the claimant(s) for enhancement are also rejected, as we find compensation at the rate of Rs.1351/- per sq.yd. for lands in village Sihi as just and proper.

With this order, challenge to the question of determination of fair market price for the lands covered under the first notification dated 01.05.2006 stands answered.

As Court time is over, the rest of the challenges regarding the second notification dated 07.08.2008 and the third notification dated 14.08.2008 will be considered on the next date.

These matters be treated as part-heard and be notified on 13<sup>th</sup> July, 2021, at the end of the miscellaneous Board.

**13.07.2021**

Hearing of these cases is continued from 08.07.2021 albeit in reference to concerned notification and villages covered thereunder.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties appearing in the concerned cases.

**RE : SECOND NOTIFICATION DATED 07.02.2008**

**Village : Murtazapur**

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. V. Giri, learned senior counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

As regards village Murtazapur, the High Court has determined the market value of lands of Village Murtazapur, referred to in the second notification at Rs.1551/- per sq.yd.

However, the relied upon sale instances pertaining to lands in Village Murtazapur would indicate that the market price referred to therein is ranging between Rs.2892.50 and Rs.2272/- per sq.yd., respectively.

These two sale instances pertain to the same period i.e., dated 09.05.2006 and 13.06.2006. The

subsequent sale instance is for relatively lesser value.

Accordingly, we would prefer to take the mean value of the two sale instances, which would work out to Rs.2582/- (rounded off) per sq.yd. As there is roughly two years' time gap between sale instances and the second notification dated 07.02.2008, additional increase of 15% can be safely granted for determining the fair market price of the stated lands. After adding that amount, deduction of 20% will have to be provided as given in other cases dealt with earlier pertaining to first notification dated 01.05.2006. On applying that analogy, the fair market price of land situated in village Murtazapur, referred to in the second notification, comes to Rs.2376/- (rounded off) per sq.yd.

Learned counsel for the State has placed reliance on the decision in *General Manager, Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. vs. Rameshbhai Jivanbhai Patel & Anr.*, reported in (2008) 14 SCC 745, to contend that the increase could be only around 5% to 7.5% per annum, as the lands in question are situated in rural areas.

This decision, in our view, is of no avail

to the State. For, paragraphs Nos. 13 and 14 of the same decision makes it amply clear that where there are special reasons for applying the higher rate of increase or any specific evidence to the actual increase in prices, then the increase to be applied would depend upon such factors.

In the present case, as aforesaid, the sale instances brought on record have been executed immediately after the date of first notification (issued on 01.05.2006), including in respect of village in question. There would be natural rise in price of surrounding areas, in particular within the village. Thus, the higher rate of price in the sale instances referred to earlier cannot be doubted much less discarded. Further, the market price referred to therein being consistent, the same can certainly be reckoned for the purpose of determining fair market price, which exercise has already been undertaken hitherto. Hence, nothing more is required to be said in this matter at the instance of the State.

Learned counsel for the State then relies on the decision in *Chandrashekar (D) by LRs & Anr. vs. Land Acquisition Officer and Anr.*, reported in (2012) 1 SCC 390, in particular, paragraph 18, to

contend that the deduction should be upto 40% of the value of the land situated in rural areas.

In our opinion, this decision does not provide for any straight jacket formula but clearly observes that in the matter of deduction, multiple factors need to be taken into account. In respect of first notification pertaining to the same village, we have already provided for deduction at the rate of 20% per annum, after taking over all view of the matter. We see no reason to differ from adopting the same scale for the second notification - as the principle ought to be consistent with regard to the lands situated in the same village, albeit forming part of two different notifications. We may further add that reliance was not placed on this reported decision when the earlier determination was done.

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 by determining the fair market price for the lands in Murtzapur village concerned under the second notification at Rs.2376/- (Rupees two thousand three hundred seventy-six only)

(rounded off) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2582/- plus Rs.387/- minus Rs.593/-). In addition, the other benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed.

Village : Bhatola

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Sanchar Anand, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

Turning to the second Village Bhatola, referred to in the second notification, the High Court has determined the fair market price at Rs.1551/- per sq.yd.

Having perused the sale instances, it appears that before the draft proposal was submitted to the competent authority on 27.11.2007, the market price was Rs.2995/- per sq.yd., which is reflected at least in two sale instances, dated 25.01.2007 and 31.08.2007. The second notification was eventually issued on 07.02.2008.

We have also noted that there is one more sale instance dated 17.10.2007 mentioning the market price of land in Village Bhatola as Rs.3513/- per sq.yd. However, this sale instance is not comparable as it pertains only to 1 Kanal 1



Marla area of land. The other sale instances consistently mention the market price at Rs.2995/- per sq.yd., which is for 18 kanals 5 Marlas and 7 kanalas 4 Marlas, respectively.

Counsel for the State was at pains to persuade us to reckon market rate specified in sale instance dated 27.04.2006 being Rs.1798/- per sq.yd. on the argument that it is a big chunk of land ad-measuring 57 Kanals 9 Marlas. We are not inclined to take this sale instance into account as it is of relatively earlier period and appears to be an exceptional sale transaction and also because it pertains to the period prior to issuance of first notification.

In other words, the two sale instances mentioning the market price of land at Village Bhatola at Rs.2995/- per sq.yd., appear to be a fair, comparable sale instance and can be the basis to determine the fair market price for the lands at Village Bhaotla, mentioned in the second notification. However, after providing 20% deductions as in the other cases, the fair market price is determined at Rs.2396/- per sq.yd.

Accordingly, we modify the award to the extent of providing fair market price of land

situated in Village Bhaotla at Rs.2396/- (Rupees two thousand three hundred ninety six only) per sq.yd (i.e., Rs.2995/- minus Rs.599/-).

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.

Village : Neemka

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Rana Mukherjee, learned senior counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

Coming to lands situated in Village Neemka, referred to in the second notification, the High Court has determined fair market price at Rs.1410/- per sq.yd.

At least, eight sale instances have been relied upon by the parties. Out of the eight sale instances, we find that the market rate of Rs.2542/- per sq. yd. has been mentioned in the sale instance dated 19.03.2007, which had been

executed much before the draft proposal was circulated and the date of second notification.

The other sale instances, however, are for relatively lower price and executed in 2006, between Rs.1922/- and Rs.2272/- per sq.yd. There is one sale instance dated 05.09.2008 for Rs.3099/- per sq.yd., however, that is executed after the second notification was issued. Hence, even that sale instance need not be reckoned for determining fair market price on the date of second notification.

In other words, reliance can be safely placed on sale instance Exhibit P-22 dated 19.03.2007, mentioning the market price at Rs.2542/- per sq.yd. concerning 105 Kanals 15 Marlas of land. Taking that as the base price, increase at the rate of 7.5% per annum needs to be granted considering the fact that there is a gap of almost one year between the sale instance and the second notification and thereafter, a deduction of 20% towards development charges. Thus, the fair market price of lands in question in Village Neemka covered under second notification ought to be taken at Rs.2186/- per sq.yd.

Accordingly, we modify the award to the

extent of providing fair market price of land situated in Village Neemka at Rs.2186/- (Rupees two thousand one hundred eighty-six only) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2542/- plus Rs.191/- minus Rs.547/-).

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.

Village : Fajjupur Majra Neemka :

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Rana Mukherjee, learned senior counsel, Mr. Ranbir Yadav and Mr. Sanchar Anand, learned counsel for the claimants-landowners.

The second notification refers to land situated in Village Fajjupur Majra Neemka in respect of which fair market price has been determined by the High Court at Rs.1410/- per sq.yd.

There are five sale instances relied upon by

the parties. The two sale instances Exhibits P-17 and P-18 (dated 05.09.2008) pertain to the period after the date of second notification dated 07.02.2008. Hence, the same are discarded.

That leaves us with three other sale instances. One of that is for Rs.4028/- per sq.yd. i.e., Exhibit P-19 dated 06.03.2007, but that is in respect of a smaller piece of land and for exceptionally high consideration, which need to be discarded. The market price, therefore, can be determined on the basis of sale instance Exhibit P-8 dated 08.08.2006, which is Rs.2727/- per sq.yd., with 15% increase due to gap of two years before the date of the second notification.

Counsel for the State has placed reliance on the sale instance Exhibit P-61, wherein the market price, is mentioned at Rs.1240/- per sq.yd. This sale instance cannot be taken into account as it is dated 23.12.2005, which is before issuance of the first notification.

Accordingly, the fair market price can be determined on the basis of the sale instance Exhibit P-8 at the rate of Rs.2727/- per sq.yd., after adding 15% (Rs.409/- rounded off) thereon and providing 20% (Rs.627/-) deduction as done in the

other cases.

Accordingly, we modify the award to the extent of providing fair market price of land situated in Village Fajjupur Majra Neemka at Rs.2509/- (Rupees two thousand five hundred nine only) (rounded off) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2727/- plus Rs.409/- minus Rs.627/-).

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.

Village : Faridpur

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Ranbir Yadav and Mr. Sanchar Anand, learned counsel for the claimants-landowners.

As regards the land situated in Village Faridpur, referred to in the second notification, in all, three sale instances have been relied.

The High Court discarded sale instances Exhibit P-4 dated 06.03.2007 on the finding that



the same seems to be doubtful. Finding of fact so recorded with regard to Exhibit P-4 is upheld. That leaves us with two more sale instances. The highest price is Rs.1932/- per sq.yd. in Exhibit P-15 executed on 20.02.2006. This is almost two years before the issuance of second notification and three months before the issuance of first notification in respect of lands in and around Village Faridpur. Therefore, relying on the dictum of this Court in *General Manager, Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd*, (supra), we deem it appropriate to provide rise of 7.5% per annum. Thus, there will be addition of 15% to the market price of Rs.1932/- per sq.yd. That means, the base price plus 15% addition would enhance per sq.yd. figure to Rs.2222/- (rounded off). After providing 20% (Rs.444/- rounded off) deduction thereon, as given in other cases, the fair market price is fixed at Rs.1778/- per sq.yd. in respect of lands situated at Village Faridpur covered under the second notification.

Accordingly, we modify the award to the extent of providing fair market price of land situated in Village Faridpur at Rs.1778/- (Rupees one thousand seven hundred seventy-eight only) per

sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.1932/- plus Rs.290/- minus Rs.444/-).

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.

**Village: Baroli/Badoli**

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Sanchar Anand, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

In respect of land situated at Village Baroli/Badoli, learned counsel for claimants/landowners, submits that the High Court has not provided separate fair market price as their lands are situated between Village Murtazapur and Village Bhatola. He would submit that the market price of one of the two villages be given to land owners of Village Baroli/Badoli, referred to in the second notification.

Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State, however, submits that the High Court has

expressly noted in paragraph 12 of the impugned judgment that no appeal for enhancement had been filed by the land owners of village Baroli/Badoli. Accordingly, the High Court has not dealt with the claim of the land owners of village Baroli/Badoli. We find merits in this submission.

If the factual position stated by the High Court in paragraph 12 of the impugned judgment [R.F.A. No.7108/2012, titled *Rampal & Ors. (II) vs. Land Acquisition Collector & Another*] is incorrect, the land owners of Village Baroli/Badoli are free to take recourse to appropriate remedy as may be permissible in law.

We are not expressing any opinion either way in that regard.

The appeal(s) filed by the State as well as the claimant(s) are disposed of in the above terms.

**RE : THIRD NOTIFICATION DATED 14.08.2008**

**Village : Bhudena**

As regards the lands situated in village Bhudena, as referred to in the third notification, the High Court has fixed the fair market price at Rs.2970/- per sq.yd.

In all, 7 sale instances have been relied upon by the parties. Two sale instances i.e., Exhibits P-44 and PW8/B, pertain to period before the first notification dated 01.05.2006. The consideration mentioned therein is Rs.1446/- and Rs.1136/- per sq.yd., respectively. These instances can be taken note of only to understand the fair increase in the market price after the first notification.

The sale instances at Exhibits P-39 and P-55 dated 18.5.2006 and 28.5.2006, are immediately after the issuance of the first notification, each for Rs.3512/- per sq.yd.

Obviously, after the first notification there is spurt in the land price. That spurt may not be available to the land owners covered under the first notification, but certainly it can be reckoned in respect of landowners covered under the subsequent notifications including dated 14.08.2008.

However, it appears that there is yet another sale instance i.e., Exhibit P-2 executed on 19.3.2007, for consideration mentioned as Rs.2996/- per sq.yd. Therefore, we are disposed to take the mean of the three sale instances after the first

notification, namely, Exhibits P-39, P-55 and P-2, for arriving at a predictable market price (Rs.3512/-, Rs.3512 and Rs.2996/-), which comes to Rs.3340/- (i.e., addition and divided by three).

This market price can be taken as the base value for determining fair market price to be given to the land owners of village Budhena, covered under the third notification.

Resultantly, we take the mean at Rs.3340/- per sq.yd. and add aggregate 15% rounded off (7.5% per annum), as increase for two years from 2006 till the issuance of the third notification dated 14.08.2008. After adding that amount, deduction of 20% will have to be provided as given in other cases. As a result, the fair market price would work out to Rs.3073/- (Rupees three thousand seventy-three only) per sq.yd. (Rs.3340/- plus Rs.501/- minus Rs.768/-).

In our opinion, therefore, the determination/fair market price by the High Court needs to be modified to Rs.3073/-.

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.

**Village : Baselwa**

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Pallav Shishodia, learned senior counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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/-).

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.

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.

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.

Village : Mawai

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Sanchar Anand, and



Mr. Kulbhushan Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

Reverting to the lands situated in village Mawai, covered under the third notification dated 14.08.2008, in all, 10 sale instances have been relied upon by the parties.

The High Court discarded those sale instances and then went on to determine the market price of the lands in question at Rs.3300/- per sq.yd. and Rs.2970/- per sq.yd., on the analogy of applying market price of the lands in the neighbouring villages.

After hearing the counsel appearing for the respective parties, in our opinion, the High Court has not given tangible reason to discard the market price indicated in the 10 sale instances, which were relied upon by the claimants themselves.

The consideration amount mentioned in all the 10 sale instances executed at different point of time after the third notification is mentioned at Rs.2500/- per sq.yd.

The claimants having relied upon those sale instances, ought to be reckoned for determining the market price of land situated at village Mawai covered under the third notification. We hold that

the High Court has committed error in applying the principle stated in *Charandas (Dead) By LRs versus HP Housing and Urban Development Authority and Others*, reported in (2010) 13 SCC 398, which has no application when the claimants themselves come forward with the sale instances in support of their claim stating that they should get market price at the rate of Rs.2500/- per sq.yd.

It is not the case of the claimants that the sale instances are not registered sale deeds as such. Hence, taking note of those sale deeds, we determine the market price for the lands situated at village Mawai, covered under the third notification at Rs.2500/- per sq.yd. minus 20% towards development charges. That works out to Rs.2000/- (Rupees two thousand only) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2500/- minus Rs.500/-) payable to the claimants, in addition to the other benefits including the statutory benefits awarded by the High Court. The award shall stand modified to that extent for the Village Mawai.

Accordingly, the appeals filed by the State as well as by the claimants are disposed of in the above terms.

Village : Badoli/Baroli

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Rana Mukherjee, learned senior counsel Mr. Sanchar Anand, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

Reverting to village Badoli/Boroli, covered under the third notification, the High Court determined the fair market price of the lands at Rs.2129/- per sq.yd.

The claimants have relied upon eight sale instances executed between March, 2007 to April, 2007, for the like amount of Rs.2996/- per sq.yd.

There is no reason to discard these sale instances, which have been executed prior to circulation of proposal for acquisition dated 29.06.2007 and third notification dated 14.08.2008. We accept these sale instances as it is.

In that view of the matter, the claimants would become entitled to increase of 7.5% per annum as the sale instances pertain to one year prior to the notification, which comes to Rs.3221/- per sq.yd. and after deduction of 20% towards development charges, as in the other cases, we modify the award by providing fair market price of land situated in Village Baroli/Badoli at Rs.2577/-

(Rupees two thousand five hundred seventy-seven only) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2996/- plus Rs.225/- minus Rs.644/-).

Learned counsel for the claimants made an attempt to persuade the Court that since these sale deeds are to be accepted, no deduction need be made. We are not inclined to accept this submission.

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.

Village :Pehladpur

As regards the lands in village Pehladpur, covered under the third notification, the High Court has awarded Rs.2129/- per sq.yd.

The claimants/parties had relied on three sale instances.

The first sale instance pertains to July, 2006 which is not in closest proximity. The other two sale instances are of March 2007, which are in

close proximity with the circulation of the acquisition proposal on 29.06.2007 and the third notification came to be issued on 14.08.2008.

As a result, we accept the two sale instances and the market price stated therein at Rs.2996/- per sq.yd. In addition, the claimants would be entitled for rise of 7.5% per annum as there is more than one year gap between the sale and issuance of notification. Thus, it comes to Rs.3221/- per sq.yd. and after deducting 20% towards development charges, the fair market price for the land situated in the village Pehladpur worked out to Rs.2577/- (i.e., Rs.2996/- plus Rs.225/- minus Rs.644/-).

Accordingly, we modify the award by providing fair market price of land situated in Village Pehladpur at Rs.2577/- (Rupees two thousand five hundred seventy-seven only) per sq.yd.

Hence the appeal(s) filed by the state are dismissed, whereas filed by the claimants are partly allowed in the above terms. Rest of the benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed.

Village : Wazirpur

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Sanchar Anand and Mr. Kulbhushan Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

As regards lands situated at village Wazirpur, covered under the third notification, the High Court fixed the market price at Rs.2129/- per sq.yd.

The claimants had relied on seven sale instances. Those sale instances pertain to the same period around which the third notification was issued, mentioning the market price in the range of Rs.2500/- per sq.yd.

Even if we were to accept these sale instances, the claimants will not be entitled for more than Rs.2000/- per sq.yd. after providing for 20% deduction as in the case of claimants of land situated in village Mawai.

In respect of lands at village Wazirpur, since the sale instances are of the same period when the notification came to be issued, no additional rise is applicable.

Accordingly, the fair market price is determined at Rs.2000/- (Rupees two thousand only) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2500/- minus Rs.500/-),

payable to the claimants, in addition to the other benefits including the statutory benefits awarded by the High Court. The award shall stand modified to that extent for the Village Wazirpur.

Hence, the appeals filed by the State as well as by the claimants are disposed of in the above terms.

Village :Palwali

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Kulbhushan Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

As regards the lands situated in village Palwali, covered under the third notification, the High Court has awarded Rs.1936/- per sq.yd.

Interestingly, no sale instance has been relied upon by the claimants concerning village Palwali as such.

The High Court in paragraph 193 of the impugned judgment has noted that fact. However, the High Court then proceeded to rely on the sale instances of villages Kheri Kalan, Riwazpur and Baselwa - the neighbouring villages. There is no clear evidence as to how these sale instances of

the neighbouring villages are comparable instances in respect of land situated in village Palwali covered under the third notification.

In absence of evidence, it may be difficult to assess the fair market price much-less to uphold the conclusion reached by the High Court.

Realizing this position, learned counsel for the claimants would submit that in that case this Court may graciously grant net market price at Rs.2000/- per sq.yd. as fair market price to the claimants of village Palwali, which would be the lowest consideration amount in all these cases.

Accordingly, we determine the fair market price in respect of village Palwali at Rs.2000/- (Rupees two thousand only) per sq.yd. without any deduction. In addition, the claimant would be entitled for other benefits including statutory benefits as granted by the High Court.

The appeals filed by the state as well as the claimants are disposed of in the above terms.

Village : Badshahpur

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Rajesh Srivastava and Mr. Dhruv Gautam, learned counsel appearing for the



claimants-landowners.

As regards land situated in village Badshahpur, covered under the third notification, it is common ground that no sale instance pertaining to village Badshahpur has been produced by the parties, executed prior to the issuance of notification dated 14.08.2008. The three other instances Exhibits P-5, P-1 and P-2 pertain to another village.

The sale instances Exhibit P-5 pertains to villages Baselwa, Exhibit P-1 to village Riwajpur and Exhibit P-2 to village Badoulia. As is found in the companion case, there is no clear evidence that the sale instances in the neighbouring villages are comparable instances.

The claimants have indeed relied upon a sale instance of village Badshahpur Exhibit P-20, but that is executed on 20.12.2011 i.e., post third notification. Notably, the market price/consideration amount mentioned in the said sale deed is only Rs.3195/- per sq.yd., which rate is after three years of issuance of third notification. This sale instance needs to be discarded.

Thus, we are left with the situation that

there is no sale instance in respect of village Badshahpur, which is prior to issuance of the third notification.

As in the companion case Palwali, we deem it appropriate to fix the market price at Rs.2000/- per sq.yd. without any deduction.

Accordingly, we modify the award to the extent of providing fair market price of land situated in Village Badshahpur at Rs.2000/- (Rupees two thousand only) per sq.yd.

Accordingly, the award stands modified to the above extent, while retaining the other benefits including statutory interest awarded by the High Court.

The appeals filed by the State as well as by the claimants are disposed of in the above terms.

Village : Bhatola

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Kaushik Poddar, Ranbir Yadav and Mr. Sanchar Anand, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

Reverting to lands situated at village Bhatola, covered under the third notification dated 14.08.2008, the High Court has awarded rate of

Rs.1936/- per sq.yd.

The claimants had relied on three sale instances, that is Exhibits P-60, P-64 and P-5, mentioning the consideration amount of Rs.2975/- per sq. yd., Rs.2383/- per sq.yd. and Rs.2384/- per sq.yd., respectively.

It is well settled that the highest sale consideration in respect of sale transactions during the same time can be reckoned, if the sale instances are comparable and not found to be doubtful.

The sale instances exhibited as P-60 is of 14.03.2007, much before the proposal for acquisition was mooted. The formal proposal was moved on 29.06.2007. There is no evidence much less credible, to discard the sale instance relied by the claimants in respect of land at village Bhatola.

Accepting the consideration amount mentioned therein as it is, and as the said sale instance is executed more than one year back, we provide 7.5% per annum increase on that amount and deduction of 20% as in other cases. Thus, the fair market price is worked out to Rs.2558/- (Rupees two thousand five hundred fifty-eight only) per sq.yd. (i.e.,

Rs.2975/- plus Rs.223/- minus Rs.640/-).

Accordingly, the award stands modified to the above extent, while retaining the other benefits including statutory interest awarded by the High Court.

Hence the appeal(s) filed by the State stand dismissed, whereas filed by the claimant(s) are partly allowed in the above terms.

Village : Murtazapur

As regards the lands at village Murtazapur, covered under the third notification dated 14.08.2008, the High Court has awarded Rs.1936/- per sq.yd. as the market price.

In all, five sale instances have been relied upon. Three instances pertain to year 2005, which need not be taken into account. The fourth and fifth sale instances are post first notification, indicative of the prevailing market price in village Murtazapur at the relevant time. Exhibit P-18 dated 09.05.2006 mentions consideration amount of Rs.2892/- per sq.yd. and Exhibit P-19 dated 03.08.2006 mentions Rs.2746/- per sq.yd.

Accordingly, we accept the sale deed executed, at Exhibit P-18, as comparable sale

instance, which is for 193 Kanals 4 Marla at Rs.2892/- per sq.yd.; and give increase of 7.5% per annum (for two years rounded off) thereon till the issuance of the third notification, which works out to Rs.3326/- per sq.yd. Indeed, this will be subject to deduction of 20% as given in other cases towards development charges. Accordingly, the fair market price is worked out to Rs.2661/- per sq.yd. (Rs.2892/- plus Rs.434/- minus Rs.665/-).

Accordingly, we modify the award to the extent of providing fair market price of land situated in Village Murtazapur at Rs.2661/- (Rupees two thousand six hundred sixty-one only) per sq.yd.

Accordingly, the award stands modified to the above extent, while retaining the other benefits including statutory interest awarded by the High Court.

Hence the appeal(s) filed by the State stand dismissed, whereas filed by the claimant(s) are partly allowed in the above terms.

**Village : Neemka**

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Rana Mukherjee, learned senior counsel appearing for the claimants-

landowners.

As regards lands situated in village Neemka, covered under the third notification dated 14.08.2008, the High Court has awarded rate of Rs.1760/- per sq.yd.

In all, five sale instances have been referred to by the High Court.

The highest consideration is in respect of sale instance, Exhibit P-12/10 concerning 105 Kanals and 10 Marlas, executed on 19.03.2007. Learned counsel for the State, however, places emphasis on sale instance dated 20.04.2006 for Rs.1271/- per sq.yd. That cannot be taken into account as admittedly, there are two notifications issued before the third notification dated 14.08.2008.

Similarly, the claimants would rely on Exhibits P-8 and P-17, each mentioning consideration amount of Rs.3099/- per sq.yd. These sale instances are after the date of third notification and hence discarded.

Accordingly, we reckon the sale deed dated 19.03.2007 exhibited as P-12/10 mentioning consideration amount at Rs.2542/- per sq.yd. That can be taken as the base value.

Since the said sale instance was executed more than one year before the issuance of third notification, an increase of 7.5% per annum is allowed. Further, 20% deduction towards development charges as in other cases have been provided.

As a result, the fair market price of the land is Rs.2186/- (Rupees two thousand one hundred eighty-six only) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2542/- plus Rs.191/- minus Rs.547/-).

Accordingly, the award stands modified to this limited extent while retaining the other benefits including statutory benefits granted to the claimants.

Hence the appeal(s) filed by the State stand dismissed, whereas filed by the claimant(s) are partly allowed in the above terms.

**Village : Fajjupur Majra Neemka**

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Sanchar Anand, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

As regards the lands situated at village Fajjupur Majra Neemka, covered under the third notification dated 14.08.2008, the High Court has

awarded Rs.1760/- per sq.yd. as the fair market price.

The claimants have relied on five sale instances executed between May 2006 until May 2008. In our opinion, the thumb rule of mean can be applied, for determining the fair market price of the lands in question. For determining the mean of the five sale instances, we reckon the consideration amount noted therein as follows: -

- (i) dated 10.05.2006 for Rs.1404/- per sq.yd.,
- (ii) dated 16.05.2006 for Rs.2892/- per sq.yd.,
- (iii) dated 03.08.2006 for Rs.2685/- per sq.yd.,
- (iv) dated 08.08.2006 for Rs.2727/- per sq.yd.;
- and
- (v) dated 16.05.2008 for Rs.1653/- per sq.yd.

The mean amount would come to Rs.2272/-. It needs to be underscored that lands in village Fajjapur Majra Neemka were also covered under the second notification (dated 07.02.2008). In reference to the sale instances relied upon therein, after applying the thumb rule of mean, the amount has been worked out as Rs.2727/- per sq.yd., as can be seen from the earlier part of this order.

Accordingly, we deem it appropriate to apply



the same rate to the lands situated in the same village covered under the third notification (dated 14.08.2008), which had been issued only six months after the second notification (dated 07.02.2008).

Thus, applying the same rate to the lands situated in village Fajjupur Majra Neemka covered under the third notification including the computation of fair market price determined in respect of the lands covered under the second notification of the same village, the fair market price of lands covered under the third notification is also fixed at Rs.2509/- (Rupees two thousand five hundred nine only) per sq.yd.

The award stands modified to this limited extent while retaining the other benefits including statutory benefits granted to the claimants in respect of the subject lands.

Hence the appeal(s) filed by the State stand dismissed, whereas filed by the claimant(s) are partly allowed in the above terms.

For further hearing to continue, list these matters on 14<sup>th</sup> July, 2021.

**14.07.2021**

Hearing of these cases is continued from 13.07.2021 albeit in reference to third notification and the remaining villages covered thereunder.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties appearing in the concerned cases.

**RE : THIRD NOTIFICATION DATED 14.08.2008**

**Village: Faridpur**

As regards village Faridpur covered under the third notification, the High Court has determined the fair market price at Rs.1760/-per sq.yd.

While doing so, the High Court relied on the sale instance dated 19.03.2007 for consideration at Rs.2479/- per sq.yd., which is certainly before the proposal regarding acquisition was mooted on 29.06.2007.

We find no reason to depart from the view so taken. If that sale instance is accepted, the claimants are entitled for rise of 7.5% per annum as the third notification was issued after lapse of more than one year from the date of sale instance.

Accordingly, adding 7.5% per annum to the

base value of Rs.2479/- per sq.yd. and deducting 20% therefrom towards development charges, the fair market price of land situated in village Faridpur, covered under the third notification, will work out to Rs.2132/- per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2479 plus Rs.186 minus Rs.533.).

Accordingly, we modify the award to the extent of providing fair market price of land situated in Village Faridpur at Rs.2132/- (Rupees two thousand one hundred thirty-two only) per sq.yd.

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.

**Village: Kheri Kalan**

As regards Village Kheri Kalan, covered under the third notification, the High Court has determined the fair market price of lands at Rs.1760/- per sq.yd.

While doing so, the High Court excluded the

sale instances pertaining to year 2006, and took note of the sale instances of year 2007. We find that approach is correct. The sale instances in close proximity ought to be reckoned for determining the fair market price.

Reverting to the sale instances of year 2007, it is true that, although, the same have been executed on different dates, the consideration amount is common at Rs.3099/- per sq.yd. That by itself does not make the transaction suspect for being discarded.

If the sale instance of 2006 is taken into account, the consideration was Rs.2273/- per sq.yd. By 2007, particularly, after the first notification was issued in respect of neighboring villages on 01.05.2006, there was bound to be cascading effect on the transactions in the neighboring villages. Perhaps, that may be the reason for rise in the price, referred to in the sale instances of 2007. The first such sale instance is of 12.06.2007 for Rs.3099/- per sq.yd. The other four sale instances of the same year around the same time are also for the same amount. The fact that those sale instances pertain to some developer, cannot be the basis to discard the same by itself, unless there is

evidence to suggest that the same have been entered into to get more compensation amount in the event of acquisition of land.

In other words, it is not a speculative transaction. That evidence is lacking in the present case. Hence, we take the sale consideration at Rs.3099/- per sq.yd. as the base price and add 7.5% per annum thereon, as the third notification was issued after one year from the date on which the sale instance was executed.

We further provide deduction at the rate of 20% towards development charges as in the other cases.

As a result, the fair market price for the lands situated in the village Kheri Kalan, covered under the third notification will work out to Rs.2665/- (Rupees two thousand six hundred sixty-five only) per sq.yd. (Rs.3099/- plus Rs.232 minus Rs.666/-).

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.

Village: Bhupani

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Smarhar Singh, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

Reverting to village Bhupani covered under the third notification, the High Court has awarded Rs.1760/- per sq.yd. In all, five sale instances were considered by the High Court.

As regards the first sale instance, that is executed on 12.04.2006 for consideration of Rs.1476/- per sq.yd. There are other sale instances which are in close proximity to the date of third notification being Exhibit P-5 dated 21.04.2008, Exhibit P-4 dated 20.05.2008 and Exhibit P-3 dated 16.07.2008, respectively. All these sale instances pertain to year 2008, executed on different dates for same consideration amount of Rs.2,000/- per sq.yd. The only exceptional sale instance is Exhibit P-21 dated 18.11.2007 for Rs.3615/- per sq.yd. That being an exceptional transaction and executed post third notification, it cannot be reckoned. Whereas, the consistent market price reflected in the other four instances

do not exceed Rs.2,000/- per sq.yd. Therefore, we are disposed to rely on the sale instances exhibited as P-5, Exhibit P-4 and Exhibit P-3 only. As these sale instances were executed around the same time when the notification was issued on 14.08.2008, therefore, the base price will be Rs.2,000/- per sq.yd. Further, deduction of 20% per annum towards development charges will have to be provided for.

Learned counsel for the claimants was at pains to persuade us that we should place reliance on the sale instance dated 18.11.2007 for Rs.3615/- per sq.yd. We are not inclined to do so. That contention is, therefore, rejected.

It was then contended on behalf of the claimants that so far as the land in village Bhupani, the fair market price determined by the High Court on the earlier occasion was Rs.1870/- per sq.yd. and in the remanded proceedings it has been reduced to Rs.1760/- per sq.yd. Hence, no further deduction is warranted. In case this argument is not accepted, the claimants would prefer to withdraw their appeals for further enhancement of the amount awarded by the High Court. We cannot decide the matter on the basis of

concession given by the claimants or one of the parties at such belated stage and to dispose of the proceedings on that basis.

Having said that, coupled with the fact that the State has questioned the enhancement granted by the High Court, we proceed to determine the fair market price of the land situated in village Bhupani at Rs.1600/- (Rupees one thousand six hundred only), after deducting 20% towards development charges. (Rs.2000/- minus Rs.400/-). Rest of the benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed. Ordered accordingly.

Hence, the appeal(s) filed by the State challenging the enhancement by the High Court are partly allowed to the above extent, whereas the appeal(s) filed by the claimant(s) for enhancement are rejected.

**Village: Riwajpur**

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Shoeb Alam, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

As regards lands situated in Village Riwajpur covered under the third notification, the



High Court has awarded the rate of Rs.1760/- per sq.yd. In all, three sale instances have been relied by the State in the Chart produced before us being Exhibits P1 dated 18.04.2007, P2 dated 18.04.2007 and P5 dated 08.05.2006, respectively.

Learned counsel for the claimants had invited our attention to yet another sale instance pertaining to village Riwajpur, which is also marked as Exhibit P-1 dated 18.04.2007, admeasuring 5 Kanal 0 Marla for consideration of Rs.5940/- per sq.yd., as adverted to at page 191 of the impugned judgment.

As regards the first sale instance Exhibit P-5, that pertains to year 2006 dated 08.05.2006. Hence, we need take that into account, as the sale instances of close proximity to the issuance of third notification are available on record.

Accordingly, we have taken into account the sale instances Exhibit P-1 and P-2 dated 18.04.2007 and also sale instance relied upon by the claimants of the same date (dated 18.04.2007) which is marked as Exhibit P-1 in the companion proceedings.

Learned counsel for the State has invited our attention to yet another sale instance of the same date i.e., 18.04.2007 for Rs.1999/- per sq.yd.

pertaining to village Riwajpur. Interestingly, we have a case where four registered sale instances are proved in evidence of the same date but having different consideration amount.

Accordingly, we would adopt the thumb rule of taking mean of the relied upon sale instances by both sides. Thus, the consideration amount mentioned in the respective sale instances will have to be added and divided by five. In that, Exhibit P-1 for Rs.3998/- per sq.yd., Exhibit P-2 for Rs.4214/- per sq.yd., Exhibit P-1 (relied by the claimants) for Rs.5940/-; as also the sale instance of the same date i.e., 18.04.2007 (relied on by the State) for Rs. 1999/- per sq.yd. and another for Rs. 2251/- per sq.yd. The mean amount of Rs.3680/- per sq.yd. can be taken as the base value.

Accordingly, the base price for the land situated at village Riwajpur is taken at Rs.3680/-. These transactions pertain to April, 2007 i.e., one year before the issuance of third notification. Therefore, 7.5% per annum natural rise is also reckoned for determining the fair market price. Thus, adding 7.5% to Rs.3680/-, the fair market price after providing 20% deduction as in other

cases, would come to Rs.3165/- per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.3680/- plus Rs.276/- minus Rs.791/-).

Accordingly, we modify the award by providing fair market price of land situated in Village Riwazpur at Rs.3165/- (Rupees three thousand one hundred sixty-five only) per sq.yd.

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.

Village- Tikawali

Heard Dr. Monika Gusain, learned counsel for the State of Haryana and Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, learned counsel appearing for the claimants-landowners.

As regards lands situated in Village-Tikawali are concerned, the High Court has awarded Rs. 1760/- per sq.yd.

The State has adverted to five sale instances - Exhibit P-16 dated 04.01.2006, Exhibit P-17 dated 08.05.2006, Exhibit P-6 dated

19.07.2006, Exhibit P-2 dated 22.02.2007 and Exhibit P-5 dated 22.02.2007. The claimants are relying on yet another sale instance dated 22.02.2007 Exhibit P-3 and one more, for Rs.2451/- each.

As regards Exhibit P-16, P-17 and P-6, those sale instances cannot be taken into account, as they pertain to year 2006. The sale deeds in close proximity to the issuance of the third notification and before the formal proposal for acquisition was mooted on 29.04.2007, are Exhibit P-2 and P-5 respectively. All these sale instances though executed on the same day in respect of land situated in the same village, bear different consideration amount. Therefore, we deem it appropriate to take the mean in respect of different transactions executed on the same day i.e., dated 22.02.2007 being Rs.2226/- per sq.yd. and Rs.2350/- per sq.yd. and Rs.2451/- per sq.yd.

Accordingly, the average/mean market price for the lands situated in village Tikawali on 22.02.2007 is worked out to Rs.2370/- (rounded off) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.2226/- plus Rs.2350/- plus Rs.2451/- plus Rs.2451 divided by 4).

As the sale instance referred to pertain to

February, 2007 and the third notification was issued on 14.08.2008, the claimants are entitled for rise of 7.5% per annum on the base price and 20% deduction towards development charges.

Accordingly, the fair market price in respect of lands situated in village Tikawali covered under the third notification is worked out to Rs.2038/- (Rupees two thousand thirty-eight only) per sq.yd. (Rs.2370/- plus Rs.178/- minus Rs.510/-).

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.

Village: Kheri Khurd

As regards lands situated in village Kheri Khurd, in all, five sale instances have been relied upon by the High Court while determining the rate at Rs.1760/- per sq.yd.

As regards Exhibit P-11 dated 01.08.2006, that pertains to year 2006. Hence it is being

discarded. Exhibit P-1 dated 14.02.2008, Exhibit P-14 dated 07.03.2008, Exhibit P-10 dated 23.04.2008 and Exhibit P-13 dated 23.05.2008 are closest to the date of third notification dated 14.08.2008. In Exhibit P-1, the sale consideration is mentioned at Rs.3512/- per sq.yd., in Exhibit P-14 at Rs.3512/- per sq.yd., in Exhibit P-10 at Rs.3518/- per sq.yd. and in Exhibit P-13 at Rs.3512/- per sq.yd. These sale instances are between 14.02.2008 till 23.05.2008 and more or less, have similar consideration amount.

Accordingly, we accept these sale instances as relevant for determining the fair market price. We take Rs.3518/- per sq.yd. as the base price and after deducing 20% cent therefrom, the fair market price is worked out at Rs.2814/- (rounded off) per sq.yd. (i.e., Rs.3518/- minus Rs.704/-).

Accordingly, we modify the award to the extent of providing fair market price of land situated in Village Kheri Khurd at Rs.2814/- (Rupees two thousand eight hundred fourteen only) per sq.yd.

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.

While parting, to avoid any doubt, we reiterate that the modified award in the above terms shall apply to all the claimants (village wise) covered under the respective notifications including the appellants in the respective appeals.

In view of the above, all appeals be treated as disposed of as per our orders dated 08.07.2021, 13.07.2021 and 14.07.2021, as may be applicable.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

....., J.  
(A.M. KHANWILKAR)

....., J.  
(SANJIV KHANNA)

NEW DELHI;  
JULY 14, 2021.

ITEM NO.15+16 Court 4 (Video Conferencing)

SECTION IV-B

**S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A**  
**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 19910/2019

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 31-05-2019 in RFA No. 3278/2015 passed by the High Court Of Punjab & Haryana At Chandigarh)

BANWARI LAL &amp; ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF HARYANA &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 9911-9927/2021 (IV-B)

( IA No.62090/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.62093/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 9249-9258/2021 (IV-B)

(IA No.3250/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.3251/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.3249/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.3252/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN)

SLP(C) No. 9118-9119/2021 (IV-B)

IA No. 149934/2018 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 9278-9282/2021 (IV-B)

( IA No.67236/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.67238/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.67237/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING)

SLP(C) No. 9937-9942/2021 (IV-B)

( IA No.61443/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.61444/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 9961-9968/2021 (IV-B)

(IA No. 16565/2020 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION)

SLP(C) No. 9969-9988/2021 (IV-B)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.68746/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.68747/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 9990-10024/2021 (IV-B)

(IA No.64152/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.64153/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)



**SLP(C) No. 10437-10449/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.64154/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.64155/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10025-10053/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.65164/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.65165/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10054-10070/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(IA No.96031/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.96033/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT**  
**IA No. 96031/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 10088-10105/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.72279/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.72280/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10109-10160/2021 (IV-B)**  
**IA No. 50556/2020 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)**

**SLP(C) No. 10166-10218/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.73289/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.73290/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10228-10236/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(IA No.79169/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.79170/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10252-10302/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.79139/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.79140/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10315-10329/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.77785/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.77790/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10333-10360/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(IA No.166190/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.166194/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT**  
**and IA No.166192/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE**  
**DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 10361-10393/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.79572/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.79573/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10078-10087/2021 (IV-B)**

**SLP(C) No. 10106-10108/2021 (IV-B)**

**SLP(C) No. 20572/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)**

**SLP(C) No. 20424/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 20107/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 20435/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 20970/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)**

**SLP(C) No. 9508-9524/2021 (IV-B)**  
**IA No. 151775/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**  
**IA No. 151776/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION**  
**APPLN.**  
**IA No. 151781/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED**  
**JUDGMENT**  
**IA No. 151779/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.**  
**IA No. 151778/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 9525-9541/2021 (IV-B)**  
**IA No. 156164/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**  
**IA No. 156165/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION**  
**APPLN.**  
**IA No. 156168/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED**  
**JUDGMENT**  
**IA No. 156167/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.**  
**IA No. 156166/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 22745-22748/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 23158-23159/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)**

**SLP(C) No. 24031-24035/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 26330/2019 (IV-B)**

**SLP(C) No. 24193-24213/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 23397-23398/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)**

**SLP(C) No. 22510-22534/2019 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 24121/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 24235/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)**

**SLP(C) No. 9907-9910/2021 (IV-B)  
IA No. 156707/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION  
IA No. 156704/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING  
IA No. 156709/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION  
APPLN.  
IA No. 156712/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 9959-9960/2021 (IV-B)  
IA No. 163756/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION  
IA No. 163755/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION  
APPLN.  
IA No. 163752/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9946-9958/2021 (IV-B)  
(IA No.29983/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA  
No.29987/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.29986/2020-  
PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.29989/2020-  
CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN. and IA  
No.29984/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 23365-23372/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 21741-21743/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 9934-9936/2021 (IV-B)  
IA No. 158327/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION  
IA No. 158326/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING  
IA No. 158328/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION  
APPLN.  
IA No. 158330/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
JUDGMENT  
IA No. 158329/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.  
IA No. 158325/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 9928-9929/2021 (IV-B)  
IA No. 156036/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9890-9891/2021 (IV-B)  
IA No. 160055/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9893-9895/2021 (IV-B)  
IA No. 154739/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9896-9906/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 179911/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**

**IA No. 179907/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 179912/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION  
APPLN.**

**IA No. 179908/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
DEFECTS**

**IA No. 179913/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
JUDGMENT**

**IA No. 179910/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 9932-9933/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 172828/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**

**IA No. 172832/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 172829/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION  
APPLN.**

**IA No. 172835/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
DEFECTS**

**IA No. 172833/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.**

**IA No. 172827/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 9689-9721/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 165153/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 26266/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 26551-26554/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 9687-9688/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 175627/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 175628/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9686/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 155718/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 25656/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 24860/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 25273/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 9684/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 161011/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9683/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 160733/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9682/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 179563/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**

**IA No. 179564/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.**

**IA No. 179562/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS**

**IA No. 179565/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.**

**IA No. 179560/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 25379-25382/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 9672-9679/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 175179/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**

**IA No. 175178/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 175180/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.**

**IA No. 175177/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..)**

**IA No. 175181/2019 - SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10219-10227/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 169536/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 169538/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9722-9744/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 169127/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 197852/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.**

**IA No. 197849/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)**

**SLP(C) No. 9943-9945/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 166279/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 197844/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.**

**IA No. 197843/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)**

**SLP(C) No. 9882-9889/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 181300/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9153-9158/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 186768/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9245-9248/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 182904/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9260-9264/2021 (IV-B)**

**IA No. 175738/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**

**IA No. 175734/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**

**IA No. 175739/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.**

**IA No. 175733/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

SLP(C) No. 9265-9274/2021 (IV-B)  
 IA No. 182177/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION  
 IA No. 182176/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING  
 IA No. 182179/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION  
 APPLN.  
 IA No. 182175/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))

SLP(C) No. 9275-9276/2021 (IV-B)  
 ( IA No.193593/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 9191-9244/2021 (IV-B)  
 ( IA No.4747/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 28737/2019 (IV-B)  
 (FOR ADMISSION)

SLP(C) No. 9289-9291/2021 (IV-B)  
 ( IA No.10836/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA  
 No.10838/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.10835/2020-  
 PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.10839/2020-  
 CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN. and IA  
 No.10837/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
 DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 9159-9178/2021 (IV-B)  
 IA No. 44304/2020 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS  
 IA No. 151957/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING  
 IA No. 151958/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
 DEFECTS  
 IA No. 151955/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
 JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 10396-10401/2021 (IV-B)  
 IA No. 60662/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING  
 IA No. 60663/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
 JUDGMENT  
 IA No. 62359/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL  
 DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

SLP(C) No. 10402-10428/2021 (IV-B)  
 ( IA No.42767/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA  
 No.42769/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT  
 and IA No.42768/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
 DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 3554/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 9405/2021 (IV-B)  
 (FOR ADMISSION and IA No.7919/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING  
 /CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 5211-5224/2020 (IV-B)



**SLP(C) No. 26329/2019 (IV-B)**

**SLP(C) No. 8007-8012/2020 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 7947-7950/2020 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 10237-10248/2021 (IV-B)  
( IA No.14794/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA  
No.14800/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT  
and IA No.14802/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA  
No.14796/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA  
No.14804/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.  
and IA No.14798/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 10303-10311/2021 (IV-B)  
IA No. 185697/2019 - APPLICATION FOR ABATEMENT  
IA No. 185692/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION  
IA No. 185691/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING  
IA No. 185694/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION  
APPLN.  
IA No. 185699/2019 - DELETING THE NAME OF PETITIONER/RESPONDENT  
IA No. 185689/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..))**

**SLP(C) No. 9759-9761/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.112853/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY  
IN FILING and IA No.112857/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA  
No.112854/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA  
No.112858/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.  
and IA No.112855/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING  
THE DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9745-9757/2021 (IV-B)  
( IA No.7762/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA  
No.7763/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE  
DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9189-9190/2021 (IV-B)  
( IA No.190236/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 28708/2019 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION)**

**SLP(C) No. 9179-9188/2021 (IV-B)  
(IA No.197423/2019-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA  
No.197424/2019-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9309-9311/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.9417/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN  
FILING and IA No.9425/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE  
IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.9421/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN**

**REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9306-9308/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.5915/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9283-9288/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.7565/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9293-9305/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.7531/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9335-9344/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.25721/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.25722/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9323-9330/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.25727/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.25728/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9345-9347/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.8011/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.8013/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9121-9126/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.14481/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9127-9129/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.14478/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9130/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.20434/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 6956/2020 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.45851/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.45855/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)**

**SLP(C) No. 9120/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.24674/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9059-9099/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(IA No.74229/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.74230/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 6992-6994/2020 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.40922/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.40924/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.40921/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.40925/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.)**



**SLP(C) No. 6988-6991/2020 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.40182/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.40184/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.40180/2020-**  
**PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.40186/2020-**  
**CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.)**

**SLP(C) No. 6995-7002/2020 (IV-B)**  
**(IA No.46388/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED**  
**JUDGMENT and IA No.46386/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA**  
**No.46385/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA**  
**No.46387/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.**  
**IA No. 34753/2021 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**  
**IA No. 34746/2021 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**  
**IA No. 25755/2021 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION**  
**IA No. 34750/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION**  
**APPLN.**  
**IA No. 26489/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION**  
**APPLN.**  
**IA No. 34755/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION**  
**APPLN.**  
**IA No. 46388/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED**  
**JUDGMENT**  
**IA No. 34759/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)**

**SLP(C) No. 9102-9115/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.74523/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.74524/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 7018-7056/2020 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.44868/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.44869/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9491-9507/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.48812/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.48813/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9468-9479/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.73649/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.73650/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.73648/2020-**  
**PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.73651/2020-**  
**CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.)**

**SLP(C) No. 7003-7017/2020 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.48126/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.48127/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9481/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.77862/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9571-9588/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.117264/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.117265/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9445-9455/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.71298/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.71300/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9589-9598/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.72818/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.72819/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9482-9489/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.69331/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.69332/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9456-9462/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.69394/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.69395/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9463-9467/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.70432/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.70433/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 10430-10436/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.76441/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.76442/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT**  
**IA No. 76441/2020 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING**  
**IA No. 76442/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED**  
**JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9668-9671/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.78747/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.78748/2020-ADDITION / DELETION / MODIFICATION PARTIES and IA**  
**No.78749/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT**  
**and IA No.78750/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT and IA**  
**No.80094/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL**  
**DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)**

**SLP(C) No. 9542-9565/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.81799/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.81800/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.81801/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING**  
**AFFIDAVIT)**

**SLP(C) No. 9406-9425/2021 (IV-B)**

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.83200/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.83201/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.83202/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT)

SLP(C) No. 9610-9612/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.84119/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.84121/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.84122/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT..)

SLP(C) No. 10071-10077/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.77617/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.77618/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 9607-9609/2021 (IV-B)  
(IA No.93784/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 9599-9605/2021 (IV-B)  
( IA No.93359/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.93361/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.93360/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.93363/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.)

SLP(C) No. 9312-9322/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.116835/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.116836/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 9331-9334/2021 (IV-B)  
( IA No.107622/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.107624/2020-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.107623/2020-PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.107625/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.)

SLP(C) No. 9348-9395/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.116832/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.116833/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT.)

SLP(C) No. 9566-9570/2021 (IV-B)  
( IA No.133736/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 9625-9667/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.116874/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.116875/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 9613-9624/2021 (IV-B)  
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.116081/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No.116082/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT..)

**SLP(C) No. 10312-10313/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.122401/2020-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9402-9404/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.9814/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9396-9401/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.41384/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**SLP(C) No. 9762-9881/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.41363/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.41364/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)**

**SLP(C) No. 3747/2021 (IV-B)**

**SLP(C) No. 9131/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.33787/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.33785/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT**  
**and IA No.33786/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA**  
**No.33788/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE**  
**DEFECTS and IA No.33784/2021-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL**  
**DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)**

**SLP(C) No. 9259/2021 (IV-B)**  
**(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.27452/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY**  
**IN FILING and IA No.27456/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE**  
**IMPUGNED JUDGMENT.)**

**SLP(C) No. 9132-9137/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.46651/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.46653/2021-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.46652/2021-**  
**PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.46654/2021-**  
**CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.)**

**SLP(C) No. 9931/2021 (IV-B)**  
**( IA No.70776/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)**

**Diary No(s). 20102/2020**  
**(IA No.72928/2021-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA**  
**No.72929/2021-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No.72927/2021-**  
**PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) and IA No.72930/2021-**  
**CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN.**

**Date : 14-07-2021 These petitions were called on for hearing today.**

**CORAM :**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.M. KHANWILKAR**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA**

**For Parties:**

Dr. Monika Gusain, AOR  
 Mr. Alok Sangwan, Sr. AAG  
 Mr. Devender Saini, AAG  
 Mr. Abhinash Jain Dy.AG

Mr. Rana Mukherjee, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr. Kaushik Poddar, Adv.  
 Ms. Surabhi Guleria, Adv.

Mr. Sumit Kumar Sharma, Adv.  
 Mr. Anurag Kulharia, Adv.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Yadav, AOR  
 Mr. Prateek Yadav, Adv.  
 Mrs. Pratima Yadav, Adv.  
 Mr. Ritesh Patil, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, Adv.  
 Mr. Rajesh Singh, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, Adv.  
 Mr. D.S. Parmar, Adv.  
 Ms. Sujeeta Srivastava, AOR

Mr. Tripurari Ray, Adv.  
 Mr. Balwant Singh Billowria, Adv.  
 Mr. Nithyananda Murthy p., Adv.  
 Ms. Bhanuprabha, Adv.  
 Mr. Vivekanand Singh, Adv.  
 Mr. Anirudh Ray, Adv.  
 Ms. Shilpa Singh, AOR

Mr. R.K. Kapoor, Adv.  
 Mr. Rajat Kapoor, Adv.  
 Ms. Kheyali Singh, AOR

Mr. Shubham Gupta, Adv.  
 Ms. Prerna Gupta, Adv.  
 Mr. Praween Gupta, Adv.  
 Mr. Ravi Kumar Tomar, AOR

Mr. Sanchar Anand, Adv.  
 Mr. Anant Kumar Vatsya, Adv.  
 Mr. Shiv Kumar, Adv.  
 Mr. Devendra Singh, AOR

Mr. Gaurav Mittal, Adv.  
 Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Adv.  
 Mr. Satbir Singh Pillania, Adv.  
 Mr. Sandiv Kalia, Adv.  
 Dr. Sushil Balwada, AOR

Mr. Somvir Singh Deswal, Adv.  
Mr. Satbir Singh Pillania, Adv.  
Mr. Amit Kumari Saroha, Adv.  
Mr. Puneet Chauhan, Adv.  
Mr. Kuldeep Singh Bhakar, Adv.  
Mr. Nischal Kumar Neeraj AOR

Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR  
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Adv.  
Mr. Ashutosh Yadav, Adv.  
Mr. Vijay Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Sujeeta Srivastava, AOR  
Mr. Dharendra Singh Parmar, Adv

Mr. Nischal Kumar Neeraj, AOR

Mr. Dhruv Gautam, Adv.  
Ms. Manisha Ambwani, AOR

Mr. Shoeb Alam, Adv.  
Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, Adv.  
Mr. Dharendra Singh Parmar, Adv.  
Ms. Abha R. Sharma, AOR

Mr. Vikas Verma, Adv.  
Ms. Sapna Verma, Adv.  
Mr. Shafik Ahmed, Adv.  
Ms. Apsana Khatoon, Adv.  
Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR

Mr. Raj Kumar Parashar, Adv.  
Mr. Sandeep Parashar, Adv.  
Dr. Nishesh Sharma, AOR

Mr. Sandeep Jindal, AOR

Mr. P. N. Puri, AOR  
Ms. Reeta Puri, Adv.  
Ms. Smriti Puri, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, Adv.  
Mr. D.S. Parmar, Adv.  
Mr. Mrinal Gopal Elker, AOR

Mr. Rudreshwar Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Kaushik Poddar, AOR

Mr. Smarhar Singh, AOR  
Ms. Shweta Kumari, Adv.

Mr. Rajnish Kumar Jha, AOR

**Ms. Anu Gupta, AOR**

**Mr. Ranjit Balasaheb Raut, AOR**

**Mr. Ravi Bhushan, AOR**

**Ms. Tanya Verma, Adv.**

**Mr. Manish Kumar, AOR**

**Mr. Ravindra S. Garia, AOR**

**Mr. Shashank Singh, adv.**

**Mr. D.S. Chouhan, Adv.**

**Mr. D.K. Verma, Adv.**

**Mr. Kulbhushan Sharma, Adv.**

**Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Adv.**

**Mr. Rohit Vats, Adv.**

**Mr. Shubham Rana, Adv.**

**Mr. Daya Krishan Sharma, AOR**

**Mr. Anubhav, Adv.**

**Mr. Yashwant Singh Yadav, Adv.**

**Ms. Preeti Yadav, Adv.**

**Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, AOR**

**Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Adv.**

**Mr. Shantwanu Singh, AOR**

**Ms. Pragya Singh, Adv.**

**Mr. Tripurari Ray, Adv.**

**Mr. Balwant Singh Billowria, Adv.**

**Mr. Nithyananda Murthy p., Adv.**

**Ms. Bhanuprabha, Adv.**

**Mr. Vivekanand Singh, Adv.**

**Mr. Anirudh Ray, Adv.**

**Ms. Shilpa Singh, AOR**

**Mr. R.K. Kapoor, Adv.**

**Mr. Rajat Kapoor, Adv.**

**Ms. Kheyali Singh, AOR**

**Ms. Charu Ambwani, AOR**

**Mr. Deepankar, Adv.**

**Mr. Sanjeev Singh, Adv.**

**Mr. Prashant Tripathi, Adv.**

**Mr. Sampanna Pani, Adv.**

**Ms. Ridhi Pahuja, Adv.**

**Mr. Rajesh Singh Chauhan, AOR**



UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

Hearing of these cases is continued from 13.07.2021 albeit in reference to third notification and the remaining villages covered thereunder.

In view of the signed order, all appeals be treated as disposed of as per our orders dated 08.07.2021, 13.07.2021 and 14.07.2021, as may be applicable.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(NEETU KHAJURIA)  
COURT MASTER

(ANITA RANI AHUJA)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file.)