

54.
54
\$~50, 54, 56 & 69

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9943/2018**

SHRI UPKAR SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr S. C. Singhal, Advocate.

versus

DSI IDC AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Kanika Bansal and Ms Nikita Salwan, Advocates for R-1/DSI IDC.
Mr Dhruv Rohtagi and Mr Kapil Gupta, Advocates for R-2 & R-3.

WITH

+ **W.P.(C) 9961/2018**

SHRI HANSRAJ SACHDEVA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr S. C. Singhal, Advocate.

versus

DSI IDC AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Kanika Bansal and Ms Nikita Salwan, Advocates for R-1/DSI IDC.
Mr Dhananjaya Mishra, Advocate for R-2 and R-3.

WITH

+ **W.P.(C) 9964/2018**

M/S SAKS EXPORT PVT. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr S. C. Singhal, Advocate.

versus

DSI IDC MANAGEMENT SERVICES LTD.

2

AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Kanika Bansal and Ms Nikita
Salwan, Advocates for R-1/DSI IDC.
Mr Bharat Singh Sisodia, Advocate
for R-2 & R-3.

AND

+ **W.P.(C) 10000/2018**

NEELAM SETHI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr S. C. Singhal, Advocate.

versus

DSI IDC & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Kanika Bansal and Ms Nikita
Salwan, Advocates for R-1/DSI IDC.
Mr Abhishek Kumar Singh, Advocate
for R-2 & R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

24.09.2018

1. The petitioners in the above petitions are the allottees of industrial sheds / flats by the Delhi State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (hereafter 'DSI IDC'). The petitioners are desirous that the industrial sheds allotted to them be converted from leasehold to freehold. The petitioners also claim that they have deposited the conversion charges with the DSI IDC for the said purpose.
2. They have filed the present petitions, essentially, being aggrieved by inaction on the part of the DSI IDC in converting the aforesaid properties from leasehold to freehold.

3

3. One of the principal reasons for inaction in conversion of the properties from leasehold to freehold is impasse between DSIIDC and the Delhi Development Authority (hereafter 'the DDA'). It is the case of the DDA that although the structure may belong to the DSIIDC but the land in question belongs to the DDA and, therefore, the DDA is entitled to the conversion charges and not the DSIIDC. It is seen that the similar issue is also involved in the case of *Shikha Gugnani & Anr. v. Govt. of NCT & Ors: WP(C) No.9772/2015*.

4. By the order dated 08.05.2018 passed in *Shikha Gugnani's* case, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had found a workable solution. The relevant extract of the said order is under:

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that while the adjudication of the issue as to who should retain the charges which have deposited by the petitioner for the purposes of conversion can be decided at a later date, the petitioners in the meanwhile should not be put to trouble by delaying the conversion of the subject property from leasehold to freehold.

7. This is, especially so, as I am informed by Mr. Dhawan that the conversion charges were deposited as far back as in July, 2013. As indicated above, Ms. Arora does not dispute this fact. She says that there could be some additional charges that may have to be paid by the petitioners.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid, DSIIDC is directed to convert the subject property from leasehold to freehold.

9. A conveyance deed will be executed in favour of the petitioners. In case, additional charges have to be paid, the petitioners will deposit the same upon DSIIDC giving them due intimation. Furthermore, if any other formalities are required to be fulfilled, the petitioners will also comply with

4

the same.

10. The needful will be done by DSIIDC within eight weeks from today.

11. Insofar as the conversion charges received from the petitioners are concerned, they will be deposited in a no-lien interest bearing Account by DSIIDC. As to which entity will finally enjoy the benefit of the same, shall be determined upon final adjudication of the writ petition.

5. This Court is of the view that it would be apposite to follow the said procedure in these matters as well. Accordingly, DSIIDC is directed to convert the said properties from leasehold to freehold provided the petitioners deposit the necessary conversion charges with the DSIIDC and otherwise comply with all other requirements. The issue whether the DDA or DSIIDC is entitled to appropriate the conversion charges, would not hold up the applications filed by the petitioners for conversion of the properties allotted to them, from leasehold to freehold. All charges received by the DSIIDC for converting the properties in question shall be deposited in a no-lien interest bearing Account.

6. It is clarified that nothing stated herein should be construed as an expression of opinion that the petitioners are otherwise entitled to conversion of the respective properties allotted to them.

7. The issue as to whether the DDA or DSIIDC would be entitled to the same shall abide by the decision of this Court in *Shikha Gugnani (supra)*, which this Court is informed is pending before the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

8. It is further directed that in the event, the petitioners are not eligible or

have not complied with the requirement under the conversion policy, DSIIDC shall communicate the same to the petitioners within two weeks from today.

9. The present petitions are disposed of in the above terms. All the pending applications, if any, are also disposed of

10. Order *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.



VIBHU BAKHRU, J

SEPTEMBER 24, 2018
MK