

\$~57

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 09.02.2016

+ **W.P.(C) 8196/2015 & CM No.17186/2015**

AMAN SINGH

.... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners : Mr Ateev Mathur, Ms Richa Oberoi and Mr A.P.S. Sehgal,
Advocates.

For the Respondents : Mr Rajesh Kumar with Mr Priyank Khattar and Mr Atul
Krishna, Advocates for R-1
Mr Siddharath Panda, Advocate for R-2/LAC/L&B
Mr Shalaj Mridul for Ms Manu Mridul, Advocates for
respondent No.3.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. The counter affidavit on behalf of respondent No.2 handed over by Mr Panda 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 contained in the writ petition which he reiterates.

2. 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.6D/Supplementary/1986-87 dated 19.09.1986 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra Nos. 554/214 (02-12) only to the extent of 845 sq. yards in village Jasola, New Delhi shall be deemed to have lapsed.

3. Though the respondents claim that possession of the said land was taken on 10.07.1988, the petitioner disputes this and maintains that physical possession has not been taken. However, insofar as the issue of compensation is concerned, it is an admitted position that it has not been paid.

4. 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.

5. 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.

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

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

FEBRUARY 09, 2016
rs

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J