

\$~17

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11023/2017**

VED RAM VERMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Agarwal with Mr. Umesh,
Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Verma, Mr. Pawan Kawrani
& Mr. Akshay Bhasin, Adv. for R-2/DDA
Mr. Rahul Sharma & Mr. C.K. Bhatt, Adv. for
DoPT

Mr. Rajiv Kumar Ghawana & Ms. Akshita
Chhatwal, Adv. for R-6

Mr. Gautam Narayan, ASC with Ms. Shivani Vij
& Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee, Adv. for GNCTD

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

%

30.11.2018

With regard to the prayers made in the writ petition, on the last date of hearing we were not inclined to consider the prayers in a public interest litigation exercising our extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. The prayers made in the writ petition read as under:

“i. Issue a writ of mandamus or any appropriate writ, order or direction for protecting the interest of residents of the New Ashok Nagar, Delhi by setting aside the Award No.39/82-83 as under shed of this award land mafia/land grabbers i.e.

respondent no.6 not only received award, compensation and enhanced compensation in crores in respect of award no.39/82-83 in collusion and connivance with Delhi Development Authority i.e. respondent no.2, land Acquisition Department i.e. respondent no.3 and Delhi police i.e. respondent no.4 which not only adversely affect the country's economy, society but also public at large who have invested their hard earned money by purchasing the land/house at New Ashok Nagar.

ii. Pass such further or other orders which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice.

iii. Allow the present PIL with costs."

Counsel for the petitioner has taken time to justify the prayers and demonstrated before us that the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution can be invoked. Today, no material is adduced before us even to *prima facie* to make out a case for setting aside an award which was passed except for making vague and general allegations. In fact, counsel for the petitioner technically has not dealt with any specific issue pertaining to the prayers.

On such indications made by this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this writ petition.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

CHIEF JUSTICE

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

NOVEMBER 30, 2018/ns