

\$~11

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 8451/2015**
KRISHAN KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. B. N. Gaur, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

26.07.2016

Counter affidavit has been filed by the respondent.

The case of the petitioner is that his second application for an alternate plot had been rejected on the ground that the requisite documents had not been furnished by him. This was vide a communication dated 19.06.2014. In this letter it had been communicated to the petitioner that on 13.12.2013 petitioner had been requested to submit requisite documents but the same had not been received. Due to non submission of documents vide communication dated 19.06.2014 his plea for alternate plot was rejected.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that all the requisite documents which included an affidavit, indemnity bond, khatauni / farad, Election Card along with three specimen signatures, Payment Certificate, Death Certificate and Legal Heir Certificate had been

furnished by the petitioner to the department on 01.07.2013 and his application substantiating this submission has been placed on page 39 of the paper book. The additional submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that in the similar circumstances, a co-owner of this property who had also set up a plea for alternate allotment which had been rejected had been granted relief and this case was directed to be reconsidered by the Department in view of the judgement passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court on 06.08.2015 in WP(C) 7133/2015 Birja @ Suraj Mal Vs. State of NCT of Delhi & Anr. The vehement contention of the petitioner is that the communication dated 13.12.2013 had been sent in a routine manner although even prior thereto i.e. on 01.07.2013 all documents (mentioned above) had been submitted to the respondent and receipt of endorsement is evident at page 39 of the paper book. His submission is that his case should be considered on merits.

The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be substantiated from the record that petitioner had communicated in his letter dated 01.07.2013 that all documents i.e. the aforementioned seven documents had been sent to the Department and the endorsement of the Department is evident at page 39 of the paper book. In this view of the matter, rejection of the case of the petitioner by the respondent on the ground that he had not submitted documents inspite of the communication dated 13.12.2013 deserves to be reconsidered. The case of the petitioner be reconsidered and the speaking order on merits be passed by the Department. In case certain documents are still required by the respondent, the petitioner

undertakes to furnish the same within an outer limit of 10 days.

Petition disposed of in above terms.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JULY 26, 2016

gb