

\$~9

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 8186/2011

BHOOP SINGH AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. N.S. Dalal, Advocate

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Nemo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

21.11.2011

%

1. Petitioners claim to be in cultivating possession of *Khasra* Nos. 21/18 (4-16), 19 (4-16), 22 (4-16) and 23 (4-16), in *Khatoni* No. 412, situated in the revenue estate of Village- Bawana, Delhi. They are aggrieved by non-recording of the *Khasra Girdawari* for the last two crops i.e. *Kharif* and *Rabi* Crop, though they had moved applications on 06.09.2010 and 04.02.2011 and again on 08.09.2011 [Annexure-P3 (colly)] for recording of *Khasra Girdawari*.

2. Counsel for petitioners places reliance upon the order of 18.03.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 2997/2008, titled as '*Bhoop Singh & Ors. Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi*', to assert that in pursuance to the said order (Annexure-P-5), *Khasra*

Girdawari for the preceding 2 crops stands already recorded.

3. The aforesaid order of 18.03.2009 (Annexure P-4) observes that recording of *Khasra Girdawari* is to be done in accordance with the provisions of Delhi Land Revenue Act. It was also noted therein that there is a dispute in respect of the land in question, as vide order of 17.09.1992, the land in question was directed to be vested in the *gaon sabha* and at that time, the said matter was pending before the Financial Commissioner, Delhi.

4. Petitioners' counsel states that as of today also the said matter is pending. Be that as it may. Recording of *Khasra Girdawari* is to be done by the *Patwari* concerned as per Rule 54 of the Delhi Land Revenue Rules, 1962. Though the applications of 06.09.2010 and 04.02.2011 as well as application/ reminder of 08.09.2011 [Annexure-P3 (colly)] is filed before the *Tehsildar* concerned, but it is expected that the said applications would be placed by the respondents before the *Patwari* concerned, who shall deal with the same expeditiously in accordance with the rules i.e. preferably within a period of 12 weeks.

5. With observations as aforesaid, this petition stands disposed of, with no order as to costs.

CM No. 18441/2011 (u/S 151 CPC)

Dismissed as infructuous.


SUNIL GAUR, J

NOVEMBER 21, 2011

rs