

\$~33 (Category-I)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment delivered on: 19.01.2015

W.P.(C) 7133/2014 & CM No.16691/2014

MANORAMA DEVI

..... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr Sumit Bansal with Mr Ateev Mathur, Ms Richa Oberoi and Ms Jagriti Ahuja, Advocates.

For the Respondents :Mr Abhay Prakash Sahay, CGSC for respondent No.1/UOI.
Mr Yeeshu Jain with Ms Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate for respondent No.2
Mr Pawan Mathur with Mr Himanshu Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.3

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 learned counsel for the respondent No.2 has handed over the counter affidavit. The same is taken on record. The learned counsel for the

petitioner does not wish to file any rejoinder affidavit and would be relying on the averments made 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 proceeding initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') and 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 No.2/1 Min measuring 9 biswas in Village Chattarpur shall be deemed to have lapsed.

3. It is an admitted position that neither physical possession of the subject lands 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 lands 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

JANUARY 19, 2015

st