

\$~51

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

% Judgment delivered on: 13.02.2017

+ **W.P.(C) 8630/2015 & CM 18764/2015**

SAMO Petitioner

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr Yogender Kumar with Mr Lalit
Kumar, Mr Vishal Thakur, Mr Siddarth Gupta.
For the Respondent L&B/LAC : M Yeeshu Jain with Ms Jyoti Tyagi
For the Respondent DDA : Mr Dhanesh Relan with Mr Akshita Manocha

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 initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') in respect of which Award No.8/1992-93 dated 19.06.1992 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of

the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra Nos. 17 (4-12), 18 (3-14), 38 (1-12), 41 (1-16) and 42 (1-10) measuring 13 bighas 4 biswas (to the extent of 1/12 share therein) in village Ghonda Gujran Khadar, Delhi, shall be deemed to have lapsed. Apart from this land, the petitioner has also made a reference to khasra no. 861/639 (1-15). But, as per the respondents and, particularly, the Land Acquisition Collector, this land was never be the subject matter of the award. Therefore, the said land was not the subject matter of acquisition. The petition, therefore, pertains to the rest of the land.

2. Though the respondents claimed that possession of the said land was taken on 21.03.2007, the petitioner disputes this and maintains that physical possession has not been taken. However, insofar as the issue of compensation is concerned, it is an admitted position that it has not been paid.

3. Without going into the controversy of physical possession, this much is clear that the Award was made more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act and the compensation has also not been paid. The necessary ingredients for the application of Section 24(2) of

the 2013 Act as interpreted by the Supreme Court and this Court in the following cases 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:** Civil Appeal No. 8700/2013 decided on 10.09.2014;
- (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. As a result, the petitioner is entitled to a declaration that the said acquisition proceedings initiated under the 1894 Act in respect of the subject land are deemed to have lapsed. It is so declared.

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

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2016
kb

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J