

\$~28

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

+ W.P.(C) 2324/2015

MOHAR SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr S.N. Bhardwaj & Mr Y.R. Sharma,
Advs.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Jaswant Singh, Adv. for Mr Yeeshu
Jain, Adv. for R-1.

Mr Dhanesh Relan & Mr Arush Bhandari, Advs.
for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **14.07.2015**

1. This writ petition is directed against communication dated 19.06.2014 issued by respondent no.1. The petitioner seeks to assail the said communication whereby, his request for allotment of an alternate plot in lieu of land acquired, was rejected.

2. The record seems to show that prior to the impugned letter, a communication was sent to the petitioner on 09.12.2013 wherein, it was indicated to him that his case was put up before the recommendation committee, at its meeting held, on 14.11.2013. The said communication went on to state that, pursuant to the meeting held, the recommendation committee had required the following documents/ information from the petitioner:

“1. Proper Indemnity Bond duly registered with Sub Registrar office in favour of President of India through Secretary (L&B), GNCTD.

2. Sale deed of acquired land in original..”

2.1 The aforementioned information, however, was required to be submitted by the petitioner by 12.12.2013.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the said letter dated 09.12.2013 was received by him only on 13.12.2013 and, therefore, the information could not be supplied by the date fixed i.e. 12.12.2013. A communication in that behalf was sent by the petitioner to respondent no.1, on 14.12.2013, by post. A receipt in original is appended at page 115 along with copy of the petitioner’s letter dated 14.12.2013. The petitioner emphasise that all documents have been sent, as sought by respondent no.1 under the cover of letter dated 23.12.2013. To be noted, the said letter is appended at page 117 of the paper book.

4. In my view, the respondent ought to consider the petitioner’s request for allotment of an alternate plot as the delay in submission of documents was not on his account. Accordingly, the communication dated 19.06.2014 is set aside. Respondent no.1 will re-consider the case of the petitioner for allotment of an alternate plot after taking into account the documents submitted by him. Needless to say, the aforesaid exercise will be completed with expedition though, not later than three (3) months from today. Upon a decision being taken in the matter, the same will be communicated to the petitioner. Respondent no.1 will pass a speaking order in that behalf.

5. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

6. Dasti.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JULY 14, 2015/kk