



\$~50

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010378052026

+ **W.P.(C) 11783/2026**

ABDUL KHALIQ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shiv Shankar Parashar, Adv.

versus

SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC for DDA
with Mr. Aman Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Prashant Diwan, Govt. Counsel
for R-1 & R-2.

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER
09.09.2026

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CM APPL. 54429/2026

2. The present application has been filed by the Petitioner seeking condonation of delay in filing the present petition.

3. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the delay in filing the present petition is condoned.

4. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 11783/2026

5. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, seeking issuance of an appropriate writ directing the Respondents to decide the reference petition filed by the



Petitioner.

6. The Petitioner is stated to have purchased property measuring 1 *bigha* and 1 *biswa* in *Khasra* No. 219, situated at Village Jasola, South-East Delhi. The claim of the Petitioner is that the same was purchased through a registered Sale Deed executed on 17th December, 1996. The subject land, however, was acquired *vide* the **Award No. 4/97-98** on 05th December, 1997 and possession has also been taken by the Delhi Development Authority (hereinafter, 'DDA').

7. According to the Petitioner, compensation was paid to Abdul Khaliq son of Mohd. Idris *i.e.*, the Petitioner amounting to Rs.59,826/-. Thereafter, the Petitioner is stated to have filed representations for enhanced compensation. The grievance of the Petitioner is that the same has not been considered by the LAC.

8. Ld. Counsel for the LAC submits that the Petitioner would not be entitled to any relief as the remedy of filing petition under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 has already been availed of by the Petitioner.

9. Heard the Ld. Counsels.

10. The Sale Deed through which the Petitioner is stated to have purchased the property has not been placed on record. One of the representations which has been placed on record is dated 25th July, 2007 and there appears to be a diary number of 31st December, 2007. It is, thus, not clear as to when the said representation was in fact filed. There is another representation dated 16th August, 1999 wherein the Petitioner is praying for an alternate plot. After 15 years, a further representation was made on 15th December, 2021 and the writ petition is now being filed 7 years later.

11. The only relief this Court is inclined to pass at this stage is to direct the



LAC to look into the representations of the Petitioner and the petition filed under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 and proceed in accordance with law.

12. Accordingly, let the LAC take a decision in this matter within a period of three months. If the LAC requires any documents to be produced, the LAC shall give notice to the Petitioner, who shall produce the same.

13. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J.

SEPTEMBER 9, 2026/dss/Ck