

\$~40

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

% Judgment delivered on: 01.12.2015

+ **W.P.(C) 3539/2015 & CM No.6299/2015**

SHAKEEL AHMED Petitioner

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS. Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners : Mr Rajat Malhotra, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr Yeeshu Jain with Ms Jyoti Tyagi, Advocates for
L&B/LAC.

Mr Venkat Raman, Mr Dinesh K. Chawla and Mr Mohd.
Asad, Advocates

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks 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 proceeding initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') in respect of which Award No.63/82-83 dated 31.01.1983 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of

the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra Nos. 273(4- 16) and 274 min (2-18), in all measuring 7 bighas and 14 biswas, situated in Village Pul Pehladpur, New Delhi, shall be deemed to have lapsed.

2. We may also point out that there is an ownership dispute in so far as the subject land is concerned between the petitioner and the Respondent No. 5 in respect of part thereof. We are not concerned with that dispute and the same would have to be sorted out between them in appropriate proceedings in accordance with law. It may be pointed out that the learned counsel for the petitioner stated that the petitioner only has a 1/4th share in Khasra No. 273 and in Khasra No. 274.

3. Though the respondents claimed that possession of the said land was taken on 04.03.1983, the petitioner disputes this and maintains that physical possession has not been taken. However, insofar as the issue of compensation is concerned, it is an admitted position that it has not been paid.

4. 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.

5. 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.

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

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

DECEMBER 1st, 2015
rs

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J