

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP [C] NOS.13955-13960/2023]

SUMAN

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 20463/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 19963-19975/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 19977/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@SLP(C) No. 8594/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 21852-21856/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 20474-20483/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 24355/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 25843/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 24673/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 27434/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 3240/2024 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) No. 4571/2024 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 7519-7526/2024 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 7527-7528/2024 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 7517-7518/2024 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 20315-20316/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 18952-18955/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 13791-13806/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 11323-11350/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 13807-13824/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
 [@ SLP(C) Nos. 13462-13473/2023 (IV-B)]

O R D E R

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP [C] Nos. 13955-13960/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 18952-18955/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 13807-13824/2023]

Leave granted.

We have heard the learned senior counsel and learned counsel appearing for the appellants and the respondents.

By the impugned judgment(s), the High Court was

pleased to restore the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector, which had fixed the Award at Rs.30 lakhs per acre.

The date of the Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act, 1894') is 24.05.2011. The Land Acquisition Collector had taken into consideration the date of the sale deed produced by the respondents, while ignoring the documents produced by the appellants. However, the Reference Court vide order dated 03.07.2017 took into consideration Exhibit P-4/C, which was the sale deed produced by the appellants pertaining to the same village that has been subjected to acquisition. While doing so, the Reference Court, after having found that the aforesaid sale deed, relied upon by the appellants, was for a smaller extent of land being nearer to the main road, and applied 50% deduction as development charges.

Suffice it is to state that the Reference Court had consciously not considered the enhancement, as the sale deed relied upon by the appellants was of the year 2010, while acquisition was of the year 2011, though the difference is only 6 months.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the appellants would submit that, apart from the view of the Reference Court having accepted the sale deed of

the highest value, the fact remains that there is no dispute with respect to the land, which was subject matter of the sale deed (Exhibit P-4/C), relied upon by the appellants, being situated within the same village which has been subjected to acquisition. Therefore, an amount higher than the Award fixed by the Land Acquisition Collector will have to be granted by setting aside the order of the High Court, particularly, when there is an error in relying upon the sale deed produced post the date of Notification and for a lesser value.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that there is no bar in relying upon the sale deed post the date of notification. The High Court was right in holding that the location of the lands in the sale deed relied upon by the appellants has not been proved by them, and in such view of the matter, there is no need for interference with the impugned judgment.

For deciding the just and fair compensation, the Court will have to sit in the armchair of the intending seller and the purchaser. For doing so, the land which is getting the highest valuation must be taken into consideration. Thereafter, the relevant factors such as the proximity, the nature of the land along with its character ought to be seen. The date of the sale deed relied upon is also a relevant

factor. In our considered view, the Reference Court correctly took into consideration the relevant materials. As rightly submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the appellants, there is no dispute with respect to the admitted fact that the sale deed relied upon by the appellants i.e. Exhibit P-4/C, pertains to the land situated in the very same village. The Reference Court has rightly deducted 50% as development charges. Even assuming that the potential value of the said land is higher, an extent of land is required for fixing the valuation. This has rightly been done by the Reference Court.

Though further enhancement has been sought for by the appellants based upon the year of the sale deed relied upon *vis-a-vis* the date of Notification, the difference being six months, we are not inclined to accept the said contention.

In such view of the matter, we set aside the impugned judgment(s) of the High Court and restore the order dated 03.07.2017 of the Reference Court awarding Rs.54 lakhs per acre.

The appeals stand allowed in part, in the aforesaid terms.

No order as to costs.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NO. /2025
[@ SLP(C) No.20463/2023]

Leave granted.

We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the respective parties. Two contentions were raised by the learned counsel for the appellant(s). One is with respect to the Notification which is applicable to the town. We are not inclined to accept the said submission as the acquired lands are situated in the village and, therefore, the award and consequent valuation granted to the land owners pertaining to the said Notification relied upon by the appellant(s) cannot be made applicable to them. The second contention is based upon the document produced by the appellant(s) for the first time before the High Court. As rightly considered by the High Court, the said document was pertaining to a very small extent, dealing with a developed land. Even if that document is taken into consideration after making due deduction, the appellant(s) will not get anything higher than what has already been given to them by the Courts below.

Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.

We make it clear that the appellant(s) is entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand

disposed of.

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 19963-19975/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 19977/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 8594/2023 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

The Notification under Section 4 of the Act, 1894 in these set of cases was issued on 11.02.2011. The Land Acquisition Collector, after considering the exemplars and post Notification dated sale deeds, was pleased to fix the valuation at Rs.1,30,00,000/- per acre, which has been enhanced to Rs.1,59,00,000/- per acre by the Reference Court, by way of a speaking order. The High Court, in turn, set aside the order of the Reference Court and restored the award of the Land Acquisition Collector dated 11.09.2012. Challenging the same, the present appeals have been filed before us.

Though the learned counsel appearing for the appellants relied upon the sale deed which has been rejected by the High Court, we are inclined to take into consideration the circle rate fixed by the State Government itself. The circle rate indicates the market value at Rs.3.34 crores. Though the learned

counsel appearing for the respondents would vehemently contend that the said rate depicts the commercial rate, we are inclined to fix the valuation at Rs.1,59,00,000/- per acre, as done by the Reference Court, after giving due deduction. In fact, the deduction of 50% has admittedly been made from the market value indicated by the circle rate. If that is taken into consideration, the Award passed by the Reference Court is perfectly in order and, therefore, the same can be taken as just and fair compensation.

In our considered view, the High Court committed an error in not taking the aforesaid facts and circumstances into consideration, especially, when there is no perversity in the decision rendered by the Reference Court and the consequent Award passed.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court stand set aside and the Award passed by the Reference Court vide order dated 16.09.2016 stands restored.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 21852-21856/2023 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

The lands in these appeals have been acquired for the purpose of widening and four-laning, maintenance, management and operation of a road through a Notification under Section 4 of the Act, 1894 dated 01.03.2011. The Land Acquisition Collector has fixed the valuation at Rs.40 lakhs per acre, which has been increased to Rs.82,63,291/- per acre by the Reference Court, by placing reliance upon a post Notification dated sale deed, registered after a month. The High Court, in turn, was pleased to rely upon the post Notification dated sale deed produced by the Requisitioning body, and accordingly restored the valuation fixed by the Land Acquisition Collector.

In our considered view, both the High Court and the Reference Court committed an error. The highest value of the land available before the Court will have to be considered. Added to that, we find that even as admitted by the witnesses who spoke on behalf

of the respondents, the market value was much higher than the valuation fixed by the Land Acquisition Collector.

Be that as it may, by taking the valuation of the Reference Court into consideration, we are inclined to do a guess work, as that valuation is obviously the commercial rate and, therefore, a certain deduction is required to be made. However, the valuation fixed at Rs.40 lakhs per acre can never be accepted at all.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court stand set aside. Accordingly, we deem it just and proper to fix the compensation at Rs.75 lakhs per acre.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 20474-20483/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 27434/2023 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

The Notification in these appeals was issued on 01.03.2011 for the purpose of widening and four-

laning, maintenance, management and operation of the State Highway. The Land Acquisition Collector fixed the valuation at Rs.30 lakh per acre, which has been enhanced to Rs.58.80 lakh per acre by the Reference Court. The High Court, by the impugned judgment, has set aside the order of the Reference Court and restored the compensation granted by the Land Acquisition Collector.

On a perusal of the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court, we find that it has committed an error in restoring the Award of the Land Acquisition Collector by taking note of the sale deed produced by the State on its behalf. The highest valuation will have to be taken into consideration. The Reference Court did take this into consideration, while making a deduction of 10%. Though the sale deed is of a different village, the Reference Court did take into consideration the similarity of the land, which is subject matter of the sale deed relied upon by the appellants *vis-a-vis* the acquired land. The sale deed relied upon, being much anterior to the date on which the land was acquired, only a 10% deduction has been made. The Reference Court rightly took into consideration the one and a half year gap between the date of the Notification and the date of the Sale deed.

In such view of the matter, we set aside the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court and restore the Award passed by the Reference Court vide order dated 15.12.2016.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 24355/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 3240/2024 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ /2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 4571/2024 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

The date of the Notification in these appeals is 11.02.2011 and the declaration was issued on 30.05.2011 for the purpose of widening and four-laning, maintenance, management and operation of a road. The Award was passed by the Land Acquisition Collector on 21.12.2012 fixing the valuation at Rs.30 lakh per acre, which was enhanced by the Reference Court to Rs.38,85,714/- per acre.

On appeals being filed, the High Court was pleased to restore the order of the Land Acquisition Collector.

We have perused the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court. The High Court ought not to have interfered with the Award passed by the Reference Court. In our considered view, what was fixed by the Reference Court is a just and fair compensation. The Reference Court did take into consideration the relevant material, including the sale deeds produced by the parties concerned.

In such view of the matter, we set aside the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court and restore the Award passed by the Reference Court vide order dated 14.12.2016.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NO. /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos.25843/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. /2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos.7519-7526/2024 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

The acquisition in these appeals have been made, vide Notification dated 01.03.2011, for the purpose of widening and four-laning, maintenance, management and operation of a road. An Award was passed fixing

the valuation at Rs.40 lakhs per acre vide Award No.33 dated 24.07.2012. The Reference Court increased the valuation to Rs.1,44,00,000/- per acre, placing substantial reliance upon a sale deed, being Exhibit P-2 dated 11.08.2010, which was for a smaller residential plot of 6 Marlas and applied 50% deduction towards development charges. The Award of the Reference Court was reversed by the High Court by interpreting Section 25 of the Act, 1894, while taking into consideration the post Notification dated sale deed produced by the respondent(s).

It is not in dispute that the acquired lands are agricultural lands, adjoining the road. They also belong to the same village. However, the sale deed relied upon by the appellants, being Exhibit P-2, is of a smaller residential plot. There is no evidence forthcoming to show that both the lands are potentially the same. Be that as it may, the fact remains that they are from the same village.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court stand set aside. Accordingly, we deem it just and proper to fix the valuation at Rs.1 crore per acre.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) No. 24673/2023 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

The acquisition in this appeal was of the land situated in Riwasa village for the purpose of widening and four-laning, maintenance, management and operation of a road. The Notification under Section 4 of the Act, 1894 was issued on 01.03.2011. An Award was passed on 05.10.2012 by the Land Acquisition Collector at Rs. 40 lakhs per acre, which was increased by the Reference Court to Rs.3,50,00,000/- per acre. The Reference Court relied upon a sale deed, being Exhibit P-4 dated 13.09.2010, which is admittedly for a smaller residential plot situated within the municipal limits of Mahendragarh city. The High Court discarded this document relied upon by the Reference Court while interpreting Section 25 of the Act, 1894, and accordingly took into consideration the post Notification dated sale deed produced by the respondent(s).

Though we are not in agreement with the reasoning adopted by the High Court, as one has to rely upon the sale deed which is of a higher value, the fact remains that, notwithstanding the finding rendered by the High Court, with respect to the

location of both the lands which are the subject matter of the sale deeds, one comes within the Municipal limits and the other one is in the village. Secondly, the land acquired is part of the agricultural lands, while the sale deed relied upon is part of the fully developed residential colony. Hence, the Award passed by the Reference Court also requires interference.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court stand set aside. Accordingly, we deem it just and proper to fix the valuation at Rs.2.25 crores per acre, without any deduction.

The appeal stands allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellant is entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 7527-7528/2024 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

In the present appeals, we are concerned with an increase in the market value between the one awarded by the Reference Court and the High Court.

While the Land Acquisition Collector fixed the valuation at Rs.40 lakhs per acre vide award dated 22.08.2012, the Reference Court fixed it at Rs.80 lakhs per acre after a deduction of 75%. In our considered view, the High Court ought not to have interfered with the valuation fixed by the Reference Court, as the difference is minor and, especially, when the Reference Court, being the Court of first instance, has considered the relevant materials.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgment(s) passed by the High Court stands set aside, and the order dated 02.01.2017 of the Reference Court stands restored.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellant is entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 7517-7518/2024 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

In view of the order passed in Civil Appeal Nos. _____/2025 arising out of SLP(C) Nos. 20474-20483/2023, we set aside the impugned judgment passed by the High Court, and restore the valuation at

Rs.58,80,000/- per acre, passed by the Reference Court vide order dated 01.02.2017.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 20315-20316/2023 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

This is another case where the Reference Court has enhanced the Award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector from Rs.20 lakhs per acre to Rs.38,71,998/- per acre. This order of the Reference Court has been interfered with by the High Court, without giving any acceptable reasons. The Reference Court rightly considered Exhibit P-1, being a sale deed dated 21.05.2007, and made appropriate deduction by reducing 50% towards development charges. Thereafter only, a sum of Rs.38,71,998/- per acre has been arrived at, which we find to be just and proper. The High Court did not specifically go into the discussions made by the Reference Court.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgment(s) stand set aside and the order dated

18.07.2017 passed by the Reference Court stands restored.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellant is entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 13791-13806/2023 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

This is yet another case where the Reference Court has enhanced the Award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector from Rs.30 lakhs per acre to Rs.54 lakhs per acre. This order of the Reference Court has been interfered with by the High Court, without giving any acceptable reasons. The Reference Court rightly considered Exhibit P-7 dated 07.09.2016. Thereafter only, a sum of Rs.54 lakhs per acre has been arrived at by the Reference Court, which we find to be just and proper. The High Court did not specifically go into the discussions made by the Reference Court.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgment(s) of the High Court stand set aside and the order dated 07.10.2016 passed by the Reference Court stands restored.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 11323-11350/2023 (IV-B)]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____/2025
[@ SLP(C) Nos. 13462-13473/2023 (IV-B)]

Leave granted.

In these appeals, the Reference Court has enhanced the Award passed by the Land Acquisition Collector from Rs.20 lakhs per acre to Rs.37,65,842/- per acre. This has been interfered with by the High Court, without giving any acceptable reasons. The Reference Court rightly considered Exhibits P-1, P-2 and P-10. Thereafter only, a sum of Rs.37,65,842/- per acre has been arrived at, which we find to be just and proper.

The High Court did not specifically go into the discussions made by the Reference Court.

In such view of the matter, the impugned judgments of the High Court stand set aside, and the order dated 01.04.2017 passed by the Reference Court stands restored.

The appeals stand allowed, in the aforesaid

terms.

We make it clear that the appellants are entitled to all the consequential statutory benefits.

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

.....J.
[M.M. SUNDRESH]

.....J.
[NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH]

NEW DELHI;
AUGUST 19, 2025.

ITEM NO.13

COURT NO.4

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). 13955-13960/2023

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 09-11-2022 in RFA No. 4923/2017 09-11-2022 in XOBJR No. 30/2018 09-11-2022 in RFA No. 4930/2017 09-11-2022 in XOBJR No. 29/2018 09-11-2022 in RFA No. 4994/2017 09-11-2022 in XOBJR No. 28/2018 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

SUMAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION and I.R.

WITH

SLP(C) No. 20463/2023 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 19963-19975/2023 (IV-B)

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 170828/2023

FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA 170837/2023

SLP(C) No. 19977/2023 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 8594/2023 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 21852-21856/2023 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 20474-20483/2023 (IV-B)

IA No. 174194/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

SLP(C) No. 24355/2023 (IV-B)

IA No. 218582/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

SLP(C) No. 25843/2023 (IV-B)

IA No. 228603/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

SLP(C) No. 24673/2023 (IV-B)

IA No. 219175/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

SLP(C) No. 27434/2023 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 3240/2024 (IV-B)

IA No. 22559/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

SLP(C) No. 4571/2024 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 7519-7526/2024 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 7527-7528/2024 (IV-B)
 FOR ADMISSION and I.R.
 SLP(C) No. 7517-7518/2024 (IV-B)
 SLP(C) No. 20315-20316/2023 (IV-B)
 IA No.93793/2023-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
 SLP(C) No. 18952-18955/2023 (IV-B)
 FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.113058/2023-EXEMPTION FROM FILING
 C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
 SLP(C) No. 13791-13806/2023 (IV-B)
 IA No.111592/2023-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
 JUDGMENT and IA No.111596/2023-APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF
 DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING ASIDE THE ABATEMENT
 SLP(C) No. 11323-11350/2023 (IV-B)
 SLP(C) No. 13807-13824/2023 (IV-B)
 FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.98690/2023-EXEMPTION FROM FILING
 C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
 SLP(C) No. 13462-13473/2023 (IV-B)

Date : 19-08-2025 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) Mr. V. Elanchezhiyan, AOR
 Mr. Shree Pal Singh, AOR

Mr. Nandlal Kumar Mishra, Adv.
 Mr. Srilok Nath Rath, Adv.
 Mr. Sewa Singh Sahu, Adv.
 Ms. Reena Rao, Adv.
 Ms. Shalu Bhatia, Adv.
 Dr. Sushil Balwada, AOR

Mr. Rameshwar Singh Malik, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Jitesh Malik, Adv.
 Ms. Anisha Dahiya, Adv.
 Mr. Jatin Hooda, Adv.
 Mr. Abhaya Nath Das, Adv.
 Ms. Krishnika Chatterjee, Adv.
 Mr. Satish Kumar, AOR

Mr. Tarun Gupta, AOR
 Mr. Hirday Viridi, Adv.
 Mr. Sidhant Ranta, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Mittal, AOR
 Mr. Abhijeet Varshney, Adv.
 Mr. Sumit Kumar Sharma, Adv.
 Mrs. Shilpa G Mittal, Adv.

Mr. Vikas Verma, AOR

Mrs. Sapna Verma, Adv.
 Mr. Shafik Ahmed, Adv.
 Ms. Kavita Verma, Adv.
 Ms. Aakriti Yunas, Adv.
 Dr. Vinod Kumar Goyal, Adv.
 Mr. Bibhav Kumar Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Jamil Ahmad, Adv.

Mr. Durgesh Ramchandra Gupta, AOR

Mr. Karan Kapoor, Adv.
 Mr. Manik Kapoor, Adv.
 Ms. Srishti Singla, Adv.
 Mr. Shrey Kapoor, AOR

Mr. Jasbir Singh Malik, Adv.
 Ms. Rhythm Bharadwaj, Adv.
 Ms. Pooja Devi, Adv.
 Mr. Vijender Mann, Adv.
 Mr. Varun Punia, AOR

Mr. Devender Kumar Saini, Adv.
 Dr. Sandeep Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Suraj Pal Singh Mina, Adv.
 Mr. Vishwa Pal Singh, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Sr. A.A.G.
 Mr. Samar Vijay Singh, AOR
 Ms. Sabarni Som, Adv.
 Mr. Nikunj Gupta, Adv.
 Ms. Aakanksha, Adv.
 Mr. Fateh Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Aman Dev Sharma, Adv.
 Ms. Ishika Gupta, Adv.
 Mr. Gaj Singh, Adv.

Dr. Devender Kumar Saini, Adv.
 Dr. Sandeep Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Suraj Pal Singh Mina, Adv.
 Mr. Vishwa Pal Singh, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

SLP [C] Nos.13955-13960/2023

SLP(C) Nos. 18952-18955/2023

SLP(C) Nos. 13807-13824/2023

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in part in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) No.20463/2023

Leave granted

The appeal is dismissed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 19963-19975/2023

SLP(C) Nos. 19977/2023

SLP(C) No. 8594/2023

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 21852-21856/2023

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 20474-20483/2023

SLP(C) Nos. 27434/2023

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) No. 24355/2023

SLP(C) No. 3240/2024

SLP(C) No. 4571/2024

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos.25843/2023

SLP(C) Nos.7519-7526/2024

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) No. 24673/2023

Leave granted.

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 7527-7528/2024

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 7517-7518/2024

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed

order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 20315-20316/2023

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 13791-13806/2023

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

SLP(C) Nos. 11323-11350/2023

SLP(C) Nos. 13462-13473/2023

Leave granted.

The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.

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

(ASHA SUNDRIYAL)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

[Common signed order is placed on the file]