

\$~61

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% Judgment delivered on: 25.05.2015

+ **W.P.(C) 1692/2015 and CM No. 3043/2015**

SATISH BHARGAVA & ANR. Petitioners

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners : Mr S.K.Rout

For the Respondents : Mr Yeeshu Jain and Ms Jyoti Tyagi for R-1 & 2.
Mr Ajay Arora for R-3.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. By way of this petition, the petitioners seek 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. A declaration is sought to the effect that the acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') in respect of which Award No. 102/1986-87 dated

19.09.1986 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of the petitioners' land comprised in Khasra No. 516/482 min. measuring 233.3 sq.yds. in all in village Ghondli, New Delhi, shall be deemed to have lapsed.

2. Though the respondents claimed that possession of the said land was taken on 05.02.1987, the petitioners dispute this and maintain that physical possession has not been taken. However, insofar as the issue of compensation is concerned, the petitioners' case is that compensation has neither been offered nor paid to the petitioners nor their predecessors-in-interest. The stand of the respondents, however, is that the *Naksha Muntzamin* is in torn condition and therefore the respondents are not in a position to specifically state as to whether the compensation has been paid or not. In these circumstances the averments made by the petitioners would have to be accepted and that means that compensation has not been paid.

3. Without going into the controversy of physical possession, this much is clear that the Award was made more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act and the compensation has also not been paid. The necessary ingredients for the application of Section 24(2) of

the 2013 Act as interpreted by the Supreme Court and this Court in the following cases stand satisfied:-

- (1) **Pune Municipal Corporation and Anr v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki and Ors:** (2014) 3 SCC 183;
- (2) **Union of India and Ors v. Shiv Raj and Ors:** (2014) 6 SCC 564;
- (3) **Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu and Ors:** Civil Appeal No. 8700/2013 decided on 10.09.2014;
- (4) **Surender Singh v. Union of India & Others:** WP(C) 2294/2014 decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court; and
- (5) **Girish Chhabra v. Lt. Governor of Delhi and Ors:** WP(C) 2759/2014 decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court.

4. As a result, the petitioners are 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

MAY 25, 2015
‘sn’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J