

\$~28

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

% Judgment delivered on: 24.01.2017

+ **WP(C) No.3164/2015 & CM 5632/2015**

JAGAN SINGH

.... Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner	:	Ms Richa Oberoi
For the Respondent L&B	:	Mr Siddharth Panda
For the Respondent DDA	:	Mr Pawan Mathur
For the Respondent UOI	:	Mr Jitendra Kumar Tripathi

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

JUDGMENT

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. 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, which is the subject- matter of the present petition, ought to be deemed to have lapsed in view of the Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act.

2. The number of the award is 21/1992-93 and is dated 18.06.1992. It is in respect of, *inter alia*, the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra

No.409 min measuring 11 bighas in village Jasola, Delhi. Admittedly, physical possession of the subject land was taken on 16.07.2007. The said land is to be utilized for channelization of river Yamuna. Admittedly, compensation has not been paid to the petitioner.

3. Although physical possession of the subject land has admittedly been taken, compensation has not been paid to the petitioner and the award was made more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act. Consequently, all the necessary ingredients of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, as interpreted by the Supreme Court and this Court in the following decisions, 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:** 2015 (3) SCC 353;
- (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.

4. The inevitable conclusion would be that the acquisition proceedings would have to be declared as having lapsed. But, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as the land is to be utilized and physical possession has been taken, the petitioner is not claiming the return of the land and would be satisfied, if compensation is given to the

petitioner under the 2013 Act. This is a fair and very reasonable approach adopted on behalf of the petitioner. It also enables the respondents to retain the land for the purpose for which it was sought to have been acquired without going through an entirely new acquisition process. Therefore, we direct that the compensation be paid to the petitioner in terms of the 2013 Act. The same be done within six months.

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

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

JANUARY 24, 2017
kb

