



\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010191862025
+ **W.P.(C) 4404/2025 & CM APPL. 20303/2025**
SHAHNAZ BEGUM & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Adv Bhola Dayal for Adv Satish
Kumar Tripathi

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Respondent

Through: Ms Manika Tripathy, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

% **21.08.2026**

CM APPL. 20304/2025

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4404/2025

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs :-

“a. admit the writ petition against the respondents.

b. issue writ of mandamus directing therefore the DDA to consider and take proper decision on the representation dated 13.10.2021 filed before them after depositing necessary charges thereof bearing file No 3436(L)/Auc/30(B)/D/1325 for Restoration of



plots, in question i.e. K-16 Hauz Khas, Delhi and K-17, Hauz Khas, Delhi (as applied in respect of whole 2500 sq yds but in name of K-17 only) for issuance of issue of NOC and permission for Developments thereof.

c. Please to direct the DDA to hold an enquiry in respect of sale deed dated 24.11.2005 (in fact it is 14th November, 2005) in respect of Plot No K-17, Haiz Khas Delhi as mandated vide judgment & order dated 20.12.2018 & order dated 7.5.2024 in WP(c) No.5661/2015 after affording an opportunity of being heard to the petitioners also because of having their vested interest in the properties and pass speaking order.

d. Issue writ of Prohibition or any other writ/order as this Hon'ble Court deem fit and proper in the fact and circumstances of the present case whereby direction/s may be issue to the DDA not to further proceed with for carving out plots and/or to proceed to sale them to any third person on the land in question (i.e. 2500 Sq Yrds.) till the time the right, title and claims of the petitioners over said land is not determined and further till the time the representation dated 13.10.2021 of the petitioners is finally determined by DDA as per Rules/Regulation/Notifications/orders.



e. The petitioners herein may be permitted to reconstruct their house on above said plots as per law if their claims over properties in question are found to be genuine under inquiry as DDA has illegally demolished the same without fallowing due process of law on 14.1.2019 against the mandate and spirit of the order dated 20.1.2018 which does not warrant demolition of any structure/building.....”

2. A perusal of the petition shows that the petitioners are seeking restoration of two plots in question i.e., K-16 and K-17, Hauz Khas, New Delhi, and issuance of a No-Objection Certificate and permission for development.
3. The brief facts of the case are that petitioners are the owners of the said properties by virtue of an Agreement to Sell dated 29.09.1970, in favour Late Mr. Riazuddin, to whom the petitioners are successors in interest, and a GPA in favour of brother of Mr. Riazuddin namely Mr. Mirazuddin from its previously recorded owner one Late Mr. K.K. Chopra.
4. It is stated that the petitioner No. 1 is the wife of Late Mr. Riazuddin, petitioner No. 2 is the son of late Mr. Riazuddin and the petitioner Nos. 3 and 4 are the daughters of late Mr. Riazuddin.
5. It is the case of the petitioners that they were in possession of the said plots until their forceful dispossession by the respondent on 14.01.2019.
6. Ms. Tripathy, learned standing counsel for the respondent/DDA draws my attention to an Order of Hon'ble Division Bench dated 20.12.2018



titled ***Riazuddin vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi and Ors.*** passed in WP(C) 5661/2015 wherein the Hon'ble Division Bench had declared all transactions by Mr. Riazuddin, based on the ATS, GPA and other instruments devoid of any legal force and validity. The relevant portion of the Order reads as under:

“30. The abuse of the process of law is also apparent from the fact that the same Petitioner who unsuccessfully sought a permanent injunction in respect of K-17, Hauz Khas now comes to the Court claiming a declaration, not only in respect of that very plot, but also in respect of K-16, Hauz Khas for which he never laid a claim earlier. It may be recalled that K-16, Hauz Khas was claimed by Ms. Jasbir Kaur and she lost all the way through up to the Supreme Court. The Petitioner herein was himself a party to the suit which was partly decreed followed by an appeal which was allowed and followed by second appeal by him which stood dismissed. His SLP in the Supreme Court also stood dismissed. Despite all this, Petitioner wants this Court to declare under Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act that the same land acquisition proceedings should be deemed to have lapsed.

31. Judicial notice can be taken of the fact that the property that forms the subject matter of the present petition is extremely valuable, being in one of the prime localities in Delhi. An extent of 2,500 sq. yds. in an area such as Hauz Khas Enclave is obviously worth several crores of rupees.



That people are willing to risk being pulled up for abuse of the process of law is perhaps explained by the high stakes involved. Nevertheless, if the rule of law has to have any meaning and earlier proceedings, which had culminated before the Supreme Court in the order dated 5th August 1988, are not be reduced to a mockery, this Court has to come down firmly on this kind of a litigant.

32. There can be no question whatsoever of entertaining a petition like this where the Petitioner is himself a party to earlier proceedings where he was unsuccessful in seeking to assert his rights of possession. It is astounding that this very Petitioner is now terming the DDA as a “land grabber”. Clearly, the Petitioner through his LRs has no respect for the rule of law or for the orders of Courts.

33. There can be only one result in a petition of this nature - dismissal. However, with the abuse of the process of law being so apparent, the Court dismisses the writ petition and all the pending applications along with costs of Rs.5 lakhs which will be paid by the LRs of the present Petitioner to the Prime Minister National Relief Fund within a period of four weeks.”

7. Mr. Dayal, learned counsel for the petitioners states that he has no instructions from the petitioners in this regard.
8. Despite earlier writ petitions filed by Late Mr. Riazuddin concerning the same property having been dismissed, his legal heirs have continued to file writ petitions seeking the same relief, that too



without disclosing this fact and thereby consuming valuable judicial time of this Court.

9. Once the issue concerning the subject plots have already been adjudicated, decided and attained finality, a writ petition filed by legal heirs of the earlier petitioner, claiming similar reliefs amounts to a gross abuse of the process of law. Hence, the petition is dismissed.
10. The petitioners shall pay Rs. 50,000/- each as costs to the Delhi High Court Bar Association within 4 weeks from today.
11. Proof of payment of the costs shall be filed before this Court within 4 weeks from today.
12. In case the costs are not paid, the file shall be put up by the Registry before the Court.
13. The petition is dismissed.

JASMEET SINGH, J

AUGUST 21, 2026 / (MS)
(Uploaded on 29.08.2026)