

\$~45

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

% Judgment delivered on: 06.10.2015

+ **W.P.(C) 5666/2015 & CM 10195/2015**

NEENA NARANG

.... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner	: Ms Sumati Jumrani with Mr Amit Gupta
For the Respondent UOI	: Mr Chiranjeev with Mr Reshesh Mani Tripathi
For the Respondent L&B/LAC	: Mr Siddharth Panda
For the Respondent DDA	: Mr Kush Sharma

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. The counter affidavit handed over by Mr Panda on behalf of respondent No.2 is taken on record. The counter affidavit handed over by Mr Kush Sharma on behalf of respondent no.3 is also taken on record. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to file any rejoinder affidavit inasmuch as he would be relying on the averments made in the writ petition.

2. 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.14/1987-88 dated 26.05.1987 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of the petitioner's land comprised in khasra nos. 814 (3-5) and 815 (1-12) measuring 4 bighas 17 biswas in all in village Satbari, Delhi, shall be deemed to have lapsed.

3. Though the respondents claimed that possession of the said land was taken on 14.07.1987, the petitioner disputes this and maintains that physical possession has not been taken. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the possession of the land was taken for the planned development of Delhi but in the counter affidavit it has not been stated that the land in question has been utilised. 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

OCTOBER 06, 2015
kb

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J