

\$~5

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Judgment delivered on: 31.05.2017

+ W.P.(C) 5041/2017

RAVIKANT

..... Petitioner

versus

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT AND ORS Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Mishra with Mr. Vishal Kalra and Mr. Lal Babu Lalit, Advocates.

For the Respondents : Mr. Santosh Kumar Tripathi with Mr. Rizwan , Advocates for respondent Nos.1, 4 to 6.

Mr. Ajjay Aroraa with Mr. Kapil Dutta and Ms. Diksha Lal, Advocates for respondent No.2.

Mr. Parvinder Chauhan with Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocates for DUSIB.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

31.05.2017

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

CM No.21688 /2017 (permission to file lengthy synopsis)

For the reasons stated in the application, the application is allowed.

The lengthy synopsis is taken on record.

W.P.(C) 5041/2017 & CM No.21687/2017 (permission to represent all the persons concerned in Annexure P-1)

1. The petitioner, who claims to be aged 25 years, has filed this petition, *inter alia*, seeking rehabilitation and relocation of the erstwhile residents of the slums of Indra Camp, Block 19, Trilok Puri, Delhi as per the Scheme of the Government prior to the date of demolition.
2. On 23.11.2001, demolition of the slum cluster took place and the *jhuggis* were demolished. It is contended that on the said date i.e. 23.11.2001, the petitioner was aged about 10 years and was living in the said slum.
3. It is contended that the petitioner, after the demolition, was forced to go back to his village in Agra and lived there and completed his matriculation.
4. It is contended that the petitioner, thereafter in the year 2013,

came to Delhi to find out that all his school friends of Delhi were not able to go back to school because of the demolition and were working as daily wagers or domestic help.

5. The petitioner, thereafter, is stated to have made several applications under the Right to Information Act. It is contended that the petitioner, after great efforts, was able to gather all the information with regard to the demolition that was carried out in the year 2001.

6. The petitioner, thereafter, made representations seeking rehabilitation for the slum dwellers, who were displaced on account of the demolition on 23.11.2001. As no relief was forthcoming, the petitioner has filed the present petition.

7. Admittedly, the demolition action took place on 23.11.2001. As per the contention of the petitioner, the slum dwellers, thereafter, relocated. The petitioner went back to Agra and has after a gap of over 12 years, in 2013, started making RTI applications.

8. The petitioner, thereafter, has now after further four years has approached this Court. The petition has been filed nearly 16 years

after the demolition action in 2001 seeking directions for rehabilitation and relocation of the slum dwellers, who had allegedly been displaced on account of the demolition action.

9. The petitioner is not able to point out as to whether any of the erstwhile slum dwellers or any other individual/entity had ever filed any petition qua the said demolition action.

10. The present petition, in my view, is highly belated and suffers from gross delay and laches.

11. In view of the above, I am not inclined to entertain the petition.

12. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 31, 2017/st