

\$~32

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

Judgment delivered on: 28.04.2015

+W.P.(C) 8322/2014 & CM No.19307/2014

SUCHITRA CHANDRA

..... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr L.B. Rai with Mr N.N. Rai, Advocates.

For the Respondents : Mr Sanjit K. Mohanty, Advocate for respondent No.1.
Mr Yeeshu Jain with Mr Siddharth Panda and Ms Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for respondent Nos.2 & 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. Mr Siddharth Panda has handed over the counter affidavit on behalf of respondent Nos.2 & 3. The same is taken on record. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to file any rejoinder affidavit inasmuch as all the necessary averments are contained 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.36-A/80-81 (Supplementary) dated 30.03.1981 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra Nos. 689/533/199/2 min admeasuring 10 biswas in village Lado Sarai shall be deemed to have lapsed.

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

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

APRIL 28, 2015
st