

\$~15

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LPA 559/2016 and CM Nos.37773-37774/2016

Date of Decision: 24.04.2017

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI THR SECRETARY (LAND &
BUILDING DEPARTMENT) Appellant

Through: Mr.Yeeshu Jain and Ms.Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates

versus

PAWAN KUMAR Respondent

Through: Mr.R.S.Tiwari, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. The appellant assails the order dated 25th August, 2015 by the learned Single Judge in WP(C) 7688/2015 wherein the learned Single Judge was pleased to accept the explanation given by the respondents for the delay in seeking allotment of an alternate plot against acquisition of his land which had been rejected by the appellant on the sole ground that it was beyond the one year calculated from the date when the compensation was received by him towards the acquisition.

2. By the order dated 25th August, 2015, the learned Single Judge had directed the appellant herein to issue notice to the petitioner indicating the date, time and venue at which the respondent was required to present himself and the recommendation committee of the appellant was to afford a personal hearing to the respondent and pass a speaking order afresh. Time bound directions for completion of the entire proceedings were made.

3. Our attention is drawn to the order dated 22nd March, 2017 dismissing the LPA No.138/2017 ***Government of NCT of Delhi v. Sanjay & Ors.*** and LPA No. 139/2017 ***Govt. of NCT of Delhi v. Dhan Raj & Anr..***

4. LPA No.138/2017 was filed by the Government of NCT of Delhi challenging the orders passed in WP(C) No.8636/2016 ***Dhan Raj V. Government of NCT of Delhi & Anr.*** and W.P.(C) No. 8566/2016 titled ***Sanjay & Ors. v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Anr..***

5. It appears that these writ petitions were filed by the persons who were placed similarly as Pawan Kumar who had filed the Writ Petition (Civil) No.7688/2015 titled ***Pawan Kumar v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Anr..*** After considering the case of the writ petitioners with W.P.(C) No.7688/2015, the writ petition Nos. 8636/2016 and 8566/2016 were allowed by the learned Single Judge. The challenge by the Government of NCT of Delhi to orders passed by the learned Single Judge was rejected by this Court by the said order dated 22nd March, 2017 holding as follows:

“ 7. The material available on record shows that the respondents herein/writ petitioners made applications for allotment of an alternate plot in the year 2003 in terms of the scheme. Long thereafter, in the year 2015 their applications were rejected as time barred on the ground that the applications were made beyond the prescribed time of one year. Aggrieved by the same, the respondents herein filed W.Ps.(C) No.8636/2016 and 8566/2016 respectively. The learned Single Judge found that in W.P.(C) No.8566/2016 there was delay of 7 days and in

W.P.(C) No.8636/2016 there was delay of 4 days in making the application for alternative plot. The learned Single Judge was, therefore, of the view that the negligible delay of 4 days and 7 days should not come in the way of considering their claims on merits. Accordingly by the orders under appeal, the rejection orders were set aside and the writ petitions were disposed of with a direction to consider the applications of the writ petitioners on merits.

8. The said orders, in our considered opinion, warrant no interference on any ground whatsoever.”

6. We find that the case of the appellants in LPA No. 138/2017 titled **Govt. of NCT of Delhi v. Sanjay & Ors** and LPA No. 139/2017 titled **Govt. of NCT of Delhi v. Dhan Raj & Anr.** is similar to the case of the present respondent Pawan Kumar. We see no reason at all to take a different view in the present matter.

7. In the present case, the learned Single Judge has accepted the explanation of the respondent for the delay which was occasioned in making the application for an alternate plot.

8. The impugned order dated 25th August, 2016 does not warrant any interference.

9. In view of the above, we find no merits in the appeal. The appeal and the application are dismissed.

ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

ANU MALHOTRA, J

APRIL 24, 2017/sv