

\$~14

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

+ W.P.(C) 7368/2014

LAXMAN SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. N.S. Dalal, Advocate

versus

LAND & BUILDING DEPARTMENT & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. B.Mahapatra, Advocate for
respondent No. 1

Ms. Urvi Kuthiala, Advocate for respondent-
DDA

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
28.08.2018

%

In this petition, a mandamus is sought to respondent-DDA to allot alternate plot in view of recommendations made by respondent-Land & Building-Department way back in the year 1988. Respondent-DDA in its short reply has taken the stand that respondent-Land & Building-Department had vide communication (*Annexure A-1 colly.*) called upon respondent-DDA to keep the recommendation in abeyance till further communication. In the counter affidavit filed by respondent-Land & Building-Department and the two additional affidavits on its behalf, it has not been clearly spelt out as to why the recommendation made way back in the year 1988 was directed to be kept in abeyance vide letter of 8th August, 1988.

Upon hearing and on perusal of record, it is deemed appropriate to

permit petitioner to make a concise Representation to first respondent within two weeks. Upon receipt of such Representation, the first respondent shall consider the delay aspect and also justify as to why the recommendation made for allotment of alternate plot has been kept in abeyance for so long. Let a speaking response be given to petitioner's Representation within a period of twelve weeks and its fate be made known to petitioner within two weeks thereafter, so that petitioner may avail of the remedies as available in law, if need be.

With the aforesaid directions, this petition is disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

AUGUST 28, 2018

v