

\$~24

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 12.01.2016

+ **W.P.(C) 377/2015**

DHRUB KUMAR GUPTA

.... Petitioner

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr Yog Verdhan with A.R. of the petitioner Shri Sadashir Gupta.

For the Respondent/L&B/LAC : Mr Yeeshu Jain with Ms Jyoti Tyagi

For the Respondent/DDA : Ms Mrinalini Gupta and Ms Mrinmoi Chatterjee

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

W.P.(C) 377/2015 & CM No.624 /2015(stay)

1. Mr B.S.Maan had filed this petition on behalf of the petitioner. However, there has been change in the counsel, therefore, Mr Maan stands discharged in this case.

2. The counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent No.2/LAC (South) has been handed over by Mr Yeeshu Jain. The same is taken on record. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to file any rejoinder-affidavit inasmuch as all the necessary averments are already contained in the writ petition.

3. 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.83/82-83 dated 25.03.1983 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra Nos. 748(6-01), 753 min (9-19) and 754 (6-12) measuring 22 bighas 12 biswas in all in village Mehrauli, shall be deemed to have lapsed.

4. Though the respondents claimed that possession of the said land was taken on 14.03.1997 and 01.07.2004, the petitioner disputes this and maintains that physical possession has not been taken. However, insofar as the issue of compensation is concerned, it is admitted by the learned counsel for the Land Acquisition Collector that the same has not been paid to the petitioner.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. The writ petition is allowed to the aforesaid extent. There shall be no order as to costs.

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

JANUARY 12, 2016
‘sn’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J