

\$~58

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6111/2016**

SUNDER SINGH

..... Petitioner
Through Mr.Rajesh Gupta and Mr. Harpreet
Singh, Advocates.

Versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent
Through Mr.Yeeshu Jain and Ms.Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR
ORDER
% **18.07.2016**

C.M. No.25022/2016 (exemption)

Exemption is allowed subject to just exceptions. Application disposed of.

W.P.(C) 6111/2016 & C.M. No.25021/2016 (stay)

Petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that in spite of the fact that his father had applied for an alternative plot within time, the Recommendation Committee had rejected this proposal. This was rejected vide order dated 04.01.2013. The communication dated 04.01.2013 reflects that the case of the petitioner was placed before

the Recommendation Committee in its meeting held on 28.6.2012 and the Committee had observed that the entire land of the petitioner not having been acquired and 1 bigha 14 biswas having been left unacquired and the case being prior to 30.1.1987 where the entire land of the applicant should have been acquired, this was the reason for the rejection of the alternative plot prayed for by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this has been wrongly recorded in the communication dated 04.01.2013. Out of 1 bigha and 14 biswas land referred to above, 8 biswas stood vested with the Government as acquired by an Award No.17/80-81 and the remaining land has vested with the Gaon Sabha under Section 81 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act. His next submission is that all these facts have been placed before the Recommendation Committee by a representation which had been presented before them along with the relevant document but vide communication dated 28.01.2016 they had rejected his case noting that his case can be reopened only after directions are given by the Court.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1 on advance notice submits that there are no documents which have been filed on record which substantiate these submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

This Court also notes that the entire plea set up by the petitioner is not substantiated by the full documentary evidence. Be that as it may, the petitioner is granted permission to make his representation along with all documents before the respondent no.1 and the same shall be considered within a time bound manner within an outer limit

of four months.

Petition disposed of in the above terms.

Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JULY 18, 2016

ndn