

\$~45

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

+ W.P.(C) 2636/2018 & C.M.Nos.10817-18/2018

OM PRAKASH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Pankaj Vivek, Adv.

versus

LAND AND BUILDING DEPTT & ORS

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Yeeshu Jain with Ms.Jyoti Tyagi,
Adv for R-1.

Mr.Pawan Mathur, Adv for DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

20.03.2018

After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that before approaching this Court seeking setting aside recommendation letter dated 31.10.2012, whereby a recommendation had been made by respondent no.1 for allotment of alternative plot in favour of the respondent no.3, since as per the petitioner the respondent no.3 was not fulfilling the condition prescribed in the year 1961 rehabilitation policy and, therefore, the very recommendation in favour of respondent no.3 is illegal and liable to be set aside.

In view of the admitted position, that the petitioner has not approached the respondent no.1 with any representation, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach the respondent no.1 with an appropriate representation. He, however, submits that the respondent no.1 may be

directed to deal with the petitioner's representation in an expeditious manner.

Accordingly, the petitioner is granted leave to withdraw the present petition with liberty to move an application to the respondent no.1 raising all his aforesaid pleas. It is directed that, in case, such a representation is made by the petitioner, within one week, the respondent no.1 would decide with the same by passing a reasoned and speaking order within six weeks.

The writ petition alongwith pending application is dismissed as withdrawn.

Needless to say, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the decision taken by respondent no.1, he would be at liberty to take all legal recourse as permissible under law.

REKHA PALLI, J

MARCH 20, 2018

sr