

\$~5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 414/2018**
DELHI KRISHAK SAMAJ

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.C. Singhal, Adv.

versus

UDAY PRATAP SINGH & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Arjun Pant, Adv. with Mr. N.K.
Sharma, (C.E. Branch) for DDA

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

% **30.05.2018**

1. The present petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

“It is therefore, prayed that the show cause notice be issued to the respondents and they be punished as provided under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act for violation of undertaking given to this Hon’ble Court dated 9.8.2016 in LPA No. 101/2016.”

2. In terms of the last order dated May 25, 2018, Mr. Singhal has filed the Resolution dated September 22, 1980. A perusal of the same would reveal that it was resolved by the DDA to reserve 10% shops in favour of the villagers, whose lands have been acquired. The grievance of the petitioner is, the violation of order dated August 09, 2016, inasmuch after the passing of the order by the Division Bench of this Court, advertisement has been issued without granting the benefit of reservation to the villagers whose lands have been acquired.

The order of the Division Bench reads as under:-

*“After some hearing, learned counsel for the parties state that the present appeal can be disposed of in the following terms:-
(i) As long as the Resolution dated 22nd September, 1980 is not revoked, the Delhi Development Authority will comply with the same in all future allotments of commercial shops.
The statement is taken on record and the appeal is disposed of.”*

3. In other words, the Resolution dated September 22, 1980 is not being adhered to, as the advertisement at Annexure A-5 does not contemplate, shops have been reserved for the villagers, whose lands have been acquired.

4. Mr. Arjun Pant, learned counsel appearing for the DDA states, on instructions, that the advertisement at Annexure A-5 (page 50) was for allotment of shops under General category. He states, a separate advertisement shall be issued for allotment of shops against 10% reservation meant for villagers, whose lands have been acquired within three months. The said statement is taken on record.

5. In view of the submission of Mr. Pant, Mr. Singhal states, the same would satisfy the grievance of the petitioner and the petition be closed. Accordingly, the contempt petition is closed.

6. It goes without saying, if there is any inaction on the part of the respondents to adhere to the order passed on August 09, 2016 or today's order, liberty shall be with the petitioner to revive the contempt petition.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MAY 30, 2018/ak