

\$~45

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

Judgment delivered on: 28.04.2015

+ W.P.(C) 8600/2014

MEER SINGH & ORS.

..... Petitioners

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners : Mr Aditya Singh, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr Yeeshu Jain with Ms Jyoti Tyagi, Advocates for respondent Nos.1 & 2.

Mr Sanjeev Sabharwal, 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 counter affidavit on behalf of respondent Nos.1 & 2 handed over by Mr Yeeshu Jain is taken on record. The learned counsel for the petitioners does not wish to file any rejoinder affidavit and would be relying on the averments in the writ petition.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that this matter is covered by the decision of this Court in the case of **Girish Chhabra vs. Lt. Governor**

of Delhi and Ors.: W.P.(C) 2759/2011 decided on 12.09.2014. He states that although possession of the subject land has been taken, the award under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') was made more than five years prior to the commencement 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. In this case Award No.75/83-84 was made on 09.12.1983. He also states that compensation has not yet been paid to the petitioner. Therefore, the requirements of section 24(2) of the 2013 Act have been fulfilled and the petitioner is entitled to a declaration that the subject acquisition under the 1894 Act has lapsed. The land in question is situated in Village Mehrauli in Khasra No.74//11/2 (0-14) measuring 14 biswas in all.

3. Admittedly, though physical possession of the subject land has been taken on 21.12.1983, compensation has not been paid to the petitioner. The Award is also more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act. Consequently, the decision of this Court in **Girish Chhabra** (*supra*) applies on all fours and the subject acquisition has lapsed.

4. The writ petition is allowed by declaring that the acquisition in respect of the subject land has lapsed. There shall be no order as to costs.

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

APRIL 28, 2015
st

