

\$~45

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment delivered on: 25.05.2015

W.P.(C) 1043/2015 & CM No.1834/2015

M/S. ASPIRE ESTATE PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr Sumeer Sodhi, Mr Arjun Nanda and Mr Mohit Malhtra, Advocates.
For the Respondents : Ms Bharathi Raju, Advocate for R-1.
Mr Yeeshu Jain and Ms Jyoti Tyagi, Advocates for L&B/LAC

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

J U D G M E N T

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. The counter affidavit handed over by Mr Yeeshu Jain, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos. 3 and 4 is taken on record. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to file any rejoinder affidavit and places reliance on the averments already contained in the writ petition.

2. By way of this writ petition, the petitioner is seeking the benefit of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 2013 Act') which came into effect on 01.01.2014. The petitioner, consequently, seeks a declaration that the acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') in respect of which Award No.15/87-88 dated 05.06.1987 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra Nos. 1630/1/2(2-1), 1630/2(2-0) and 1633(4-16), measuring 8 bighas 17 biswas in all in Village Chattarpur, shall be deemed to have lapsed.

3. It is an admitted position that neither physical possession of the subject land has been taken by the land acquiring agency, nor has any compensation been paid to the petitioner. The award was made more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act. All the ingredients of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act as interpreted by the Supreme Court and this Court in the following decisions stand satisfied:-

- (i) **Pune Municipal Corporation and Anr v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki and Ors:** (2014) 3 SCC 183;
- (ii) **Union of India and Ors v. Shiv Raj and Ors:** (2014) 6 SCC 564;

- (iii) **Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu and Ors:** Civil Appeal No. 8700/2013 decided on 10.09.2014;
- (iv) **Surinder Singh vs. Union of India and Ors.:** W.P.(C) 2294/2014 decided 12.09.2014 by this Court.

4. As a result, the petitioner is entitled to a declaration that the said acquisition proceedings initiated under the 1894 Act in respect of the subject land are deemed to have lapsed. It is so declared.

5. The writ petition is allowed to the aforesaid extent. There shall be no order as to costs.

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 25, 2015
‘sn’