

\$~15

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

+ W.P.(C) 4405/2014

COL. DEVENDER SINGH SOLANKI (RETD.) Petitioner
Through: Mr. Pramod Kr. Sharma, Adv.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI Respondent
Through: Ms. Deepika, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

14.01.2015

1. This writ petition seeks to assail the order dated 01.01.2014 whereby the petitioner's request for allotment of an alternative plot in lieu of the land acquired of him, was rejected.

2. Notice in this petition was issued on 18.07.2014 whereupon the respondent has entered appearance. Though time was granted to the respondent to file a counter affidavit, no steps have been taken in that behalf.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner says that the controversy is short. It is his contention that post the passing of the impugned order dated 01.01.2014, a representation was made to the Principal Secretary, Land and Building Department, on 24.01.2014 whereby correct facts were sought to be brought to the notice of the aforementioned officer.

3.1 The learned counsel contends that the request for alternate plot was rejected only on the ground that the petitioner's wife had a property in her name, being : property no.D-7, Main Road, Mahavir Enclave, New Delhi

W.P.(C) 4405/2014

page 1 of 2

(outside Village abadi area, Resettlement Colony).

3.2 The learned counsel submits that it has been sought to be brought to the notice of the respondent with the help of requisite documents that the said property was transferred in the name of the petitioner's son, Mr. Yashvir Solanki, as far back, as on 16.05.1983, and that, his son thereafter, had constructed a house on the said property, in 1987.

3.3 The learned counsel submits that the petitioner's son alongwith his family is residing in the said property. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the aforementioned representation was followed by a representation dated 26.03.2014, as also a representation dated 11.04.2014, addressed to the Lt. Governor.

3.4 The learned counsel for the petitioner says that the respondents have not dealt with the petitioner's representation.

4. In these circumstances, for the moment, the only direction which can be passed is, to direct the respondent to dispose of the pending representation(s) with expedition. It is ordered accordingly. The respondent will dispose of the representation(s), which has been filed by the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible though not later than six weeks from today.

4.1 In case the petitioner is still aggrieved by the outcome, he will have liberty to approach this court once again.

5. With the aforesaid observations in place, the captioned petition is disposed of.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 14, 2015

yg

W.P.(C) 4405/2014

page 2 of 2