

\$~34

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

+ W.P.(C) 10416/2017

SATPAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Kali Charan, Advocate.

versus

THE CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL  
CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI & ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Mr Rajat Malhotra and Mr Sunil  
Malhotra, Advocates for R-1.  
Mr Rajan Sabharwal, Standing  
counsel for NDMC with Mr Vineet  
Pandey, Advocate for R-1 & 2.  
Ms Renuka Arora, Advocate for R-3.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**

%

**24.11.2017**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that directions be issued to the respondents to allot an Industrial Plot under the Relocation Scheme, 1996 (hereafter 'the scheme') of the Government of NCT of Delhi. The petitioner's case is that an industrial plot - plot no.246, Sector-5, Pocket-I, Industrial Area, Bawana, Delhi - was allotted to one Mr Bharat Bhushan on the strength of him claiming to be the sole proprietor of M/s Pradeep Wood Works. Mr Bharat Bhushan also took the possession of the plot allotted by the DSIIDC allegedly on the representation that he was the sole proprietor of M/s Pradeep Wood Works. The petitioner claims that M/s Pradeep Wood Works was his proprietorship concern and, therefore, he

is entitled to allotment of the plot in question

2. The petitioner had also filed the writ petition captioned as *Satpal v. Chief Secretary, Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors* :W.P.(C) 5834/2014, impugning the allotment of the plot in question in favour of Mr Bhushan. The said petition was disposed of on 05.09.2014 by directing the concerned authorities to investigate the matter and also communicate the result of the enquiry/action to the petitioner. This Court is informed that pursuant to the said directions, an investigation was conducted and the allotment in favour of Mr Bharat Bhushan has been cancelled.

3. The petitioner now claims that the plot which was earlier allotted to Mr Bharat Bhushan, be allotted to him. The said prayer is clearly unmerited as the petitioner had never applied for a plot under the scheme. Having made no application for a plot, the petitioner cannot now be allotted the plot only because another person was allotted a plot on the strength of claiming himself to be a sole proprietor of M/s Pradeep Wood Works. Concededly, the application on the basis of which such allotment had been made was made by Mr Bharat Bhushan and not by the petitioner.

4. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

**VIBHU BAKHRU, J**

**NOVEMBER 24, 2017**  
**MK**