

\$~60

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6009/2017**

VIJAY SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Jayant Kumar, Advocate.

versus

THE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Prabhsahay Kaur, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

18.07.2017

CM No.24983/2017

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 6009/2017

2. Issue notice. The learned counsel for the respondent accepts notice.

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

“A) issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Respondent No. 2 to conclude and decide the Mutation Application No. 2/65/2017 pending before him and filed by the Petitioner expeditiously and the Respondents may be further directed to enter the name of Petitioner in the revenue records accordingly;

4. The petitioner claims to have purchased 1/7th undivided share in the total land admeasuring 44 bighas and 10 biswas out of khasra nos.10//4/2 (1-

1), 5(4-12), 6/1 (2-12), 11/16 (2-12), 24(5-8), 25(4-16), 16/20(4-10), 21(4-16), 17/1(4-12), 10/1(2-12), 221(0-11), 223(6-8) situated in the revenue estate of Village Surhera, Tehsil Najafgarh, New Delhi. The petitioner claims that a Sale Deed for the aforesaid property was executed and registered on 26.07.2016 and, thereafter, the petitioner applied for mutation of the property in his name. The petitioner states that after the said Sale Deed had been executed in his favour, the previous owner of the land had executed another Sale Deed in favour of another person. This according to the petitioner would not confer any rights in respect of the subject land in favour of the other purchaser.

5. The petitioner's grievance in this petition is that no order with regard to his application for mutation is being passed by the respondent.

6. In the given circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of by directing that the respondent consider the petitioner's application for mutation and pass an appropriate order within a period of eight weeks from today in accordance with law.

7. It is clarified that this Court had not expressed any opinion as to the claim of the petitioner and nothing stated in this order should be construed as such.

8. Order *dasti*.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 18, 2017
MK