

\$~20

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

+ W.P.(C) 6497/2013 & CM No.14140/2013 (stay)

RAJINDER SINGH & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through

Mr Rajiv K. Garg with Mr Ashish Garg, Mr
Sanjay Gupta and Ms Kavita Rawat, Advocates.

versus

STATE THROUGH LT. GOVERNOR & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through

Mr Yeeshu Jain with Ms Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for respondent No.2.
Mr Ajay Verma with Ms Kirti Parmar and
Mr Vaibhav Mishra, Advocates for respondent
No.3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

03.03.2016

1. The main defence urged by Mr Verma on behalf of respondent, DDA, was that if there was a stay in one matter pursuant to the same acquisition, it would enure to the benefit of the land acquiring agency in all matters covered by the said acquisition. This matter was specifically raised and considered in the judgment dated 29.04.2014, in **Sunil Goel & Ors. v. The State & Ors.**; W.P.(C) **No.3049/2013**. More particularly, it is mentioned in paragraph 17 of the said judgment and the argument has been repelled in paragraph 20 thereof. Mr Verma sought to raise the issue of the pendency of the Special Leave Petition being **Velaxan Kumar v. Union of India and Others** being SLP(C) 16578/2007, which was pending before the Supreme Court and a stay order was operating therein. This very point has been considered by this Court in paragraph 20 of the said

judgment and, therefore, this plea cannot be accepted.

2. In view of the foregoing, the present case is entirely covered by our decision in ***Sunil Goel*** (*supra*) and is, accordingly, allowed on the same terms.

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MARCH 03, 2016

st