

\$~46

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
Judgment delivered on: 15.11.2016
W.P.(C) 3058/2015 & CM 5459/2015

MURARI LAL & ORS.

..... Petitioners

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners	: Mr M.P. Bhargava
For the Respondent UOI	: Ms Shiva Lakshmi with Mr Sriram Krishnay and Mr Ruchir Ranjan Rai
For the Respondent DDA	: Mr Arjun Pant
For the Respondent DMRC	: Mr Pushkar Sood with Mr Satya Prakash Singh and Ms Akshita Chhatwal
For the Respondent LAC/L&B	: Mr Sanjay Kumar Pathak with Mr Sunil Kumar Jha and Mr Kushal Raj Tater

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE JAYANT NATH

J U D G M E N T

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. The learned counsel for the petitioners 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.157/1986-87 was made on 19.09.1986. He also states that compensation has not yet been paid to the petitioners. Therefore, the requirements of section 24(2) of the 2013 Act have been fulfilled and the petitioners are entitled to a declaration that the subject acquisition under the 1894 Act has lapsed. The land in question is situated in village Palam, Delhi, in khasra No.87//18 (3-03) measuring 3 bighas 3 biswas in all.

2. Admittedly, though physical possession of the subject land has been taken on 14.10.1986, compensation has not been paid to the petitioners. 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.

3. 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

JAYANT NATH, J

NOVEMBER 15, 2016

kb