

35
\$~26

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 6459/2014 & C.M. No.15477/2014
RAJPAL

..... Petitioner
Through Mr. Vikas Mehta, Mr. Rajat Sehgal and
Mr. Karandeep Khanna, Advocates.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents
Through Ms. Deepika, Adv for GNCTD.
Ms. Manika Tripathy Pandey and Mr.
Ashutosh Kaushik, Advs for DDA.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER
% **14.09.2016**

File taken up today as 13.9.2016 was declared holiday.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the communication dated 29.01.2014 vide which his application seeking allotment of an alternate plot in lieu of his acquired land had been rejected. The rejection letter had quoted the judgment of the Apex Court reported in Delhi Administration Vs. Jai Singh Kanwar decided on 14.09.2011 in C.A. No. 8289/2010 held that since the entire land of the petitioner had not been acquired, he was not entitled to allotment of an alternate plot.

Counter affidavit filed by the respondent has supported this stand. Submission is that the total land acquired in Village Dhoolsiras

was 40 bigha and 18 biswas. 5 bigha and 16 biswas of land still remain unacquired. Since 35 bigha and 2 biswas was alone acquired (out of the total land of 40 bigha and 18 biswas) and 5 bigha and 16 biswas still remained unacquired, the ratio of the aforementioned judgment (Jai Singh Kanwar) would apply.

Record substantiates this submission. The petitioner has himself in his petition stated that the total land in village Dhoolsiras was 40 bigha and 18 biswas. 35 bigha and 2 biswas was acquired. The petitioner was owner to the extent of 1/18th share in this total area of land. Submission is that this 5 bigha and 16 biswas which was left fell under the extended lal dora land.

The Award in the instant case was pronounced on 24.10.2002. As per the Policy of 03.04.1986 (relied upon by the petitioner) where the land of a person which had been acquired was less than 1 bigha, he was not entitled to an alternate plot. On this count, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that admittedly the land left with the petitioner being less than 1 bigha, even in future he would not be entitled to the benefit of this Policy; presuming that this land is acquired at a later point of time. His additional submission is that the reading of the Policy even otherwise negatives this stand of the Department and for this purpose, attention has been drawn to Annexures A-1 and A-2 appended along with the said Policy.

This Court is not in agreement with this submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner. Admittedly, there is a Policy and the petitioner in fact has at the very outset detailed his arguments in the backdrop of this Policy. This Policy clearly states that the Awards

announced on or after 03.04.1986 where the land which has been acquired is less than 1 bigha, that person cannot be considered for allotment of an alternate plot. The land left with the petitioner is 6.44 biswas i.e. 310 square yards. His argument that in future if his land is acquired, he would again not get the benefit of this Policy is an argument which holds no water as admittedly there is a Policy. It is also not as if that the Policy is under challenge. This argument based on contingent factors has no merit.

Annexures A-1 and A-2 also do not support the submission of the petitioner (a specimen of the application form and the format of the affidavit which is to be annexed along with an application seeking an allotment). In fact this Court is at a loss to understand as to why these Annexures have been quoted.

The admitted fact is that the entire land of the petitioner had not been acquired. 5 bigha and 16 biswas of land still remained unacquired. The petitioner had 1/18th share in this land. The judgment of Jai Singh Kanwar noted supra would be fully applicable.

Para 6 of the judgment is relevant. It reads herein as under:-

"The object of the Scheme is that when the land owned by a person is taken away in entirety and he is left without any house or plot, he should be allotted a plot. The Scheme therefore provided that only a person who does not own a house / residential plot / flat will be entitled to apply."

The object of the Policy (whether old policy of the year 1961 or the new policy of the year 1986) was to provide succour to those persons who were left completely landless/homeless on the

28

acquisition of the land; they did not have any house to live in. An alternate plot was envisaged for such persons whose land had been acquired in its complete entirety and they did not have any shelter. Those who had alternate covers i.e. roofs over their heads, were not entitled to an alternate plot.

The rejection letter in this background suffers from no infirmity. Petition is without any merit. Dismissed.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

SEPTEMBER 14, 2016

A