

\$~47

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

+ W.P.(C) 7905/2017, CM No. 32673/2017

SUNIL CHOPRA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Vijaya Lakshmi, Adv. with
Ms. Anita Burman, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Adv. with
Ms. Koumudi Kiran Pathak & Mr.
Kushal Raj Tater, Advs. for
LAC/L&B

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

% **31.10.2017**

1. This is a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, wherein the petitioner seeks a direction to the Land Acquisition Collector, District Central, Delhi to call back the Reference Petition bearing LAC No. 1/2017 under Section 30-31 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 pending in the Court of Sh. Tarun Sahrawat, ADJ, Central, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the necessity of filing this writ petition has arisen as despite the fact that all disputes between the petitioner and DDA as also the private parties stand duly settled in the appropriate Court of jurisdiction, a reference has been made by the LAC. Counsel further submits that the dispute between the petitioner and the

private respondents was settled up to the Supreme Court of India when RSA 60/1972 filed by Suraj Prakash and Ors was firstly dismissed by the High Court and Special Leave Petition was also dismissed by an order of March 02, 1998, and in the same proceedings, the DDA had supported the case of the petitioner herein.

3. In the above circumstances, counsel contends that the petitioner, who is more than 70 years of age, is suffering from various ailments is being harassed and his legitimate claims are not being decided and out of the enhanced compensation awarded, 40% is not being released on account of an imaginary dispute.

4. After some hearing in the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner wishes to withdraw this petition. She seeks leave to make an application before the same Court bringing the relevant facts to the notice of the Court and/or seeks such other remedy as available in accordance with law. The petition is accordingly dismissed, as not pressed. Liberty, as prayed, granted. CM 32673/2017 also dismissed.

5. A direction is also sought to the concerned Court that the proceedings be disposed of expeditiously. We direct the Court concerned to decide the reference as expeditiously as possible, however not later than six months after service on all the respondents.

G.S.SISTANI, J

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

OCTOBER 31, 2017/ak