

\$~

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

38

+ **W.P.(C) 454/2017**

KARAMVEER

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Lalit Kumar Rawal, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Yeeshu Jain and Ms Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.

Ms Shobhana Takiar, Advocate for
DDA.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

06.02.2019

1. The prayers in the petition read as under:

- a) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other suitable writ, order or direction in the like nature thereby directing the respondents to pay suitable compensation in respect of 1/3rd share out of 1/3rd share held by late Binna Narayan i.e. 01 Bigha and 09 biswas of the acquired land forming part of Khasra No 489 (13-4) situated in the revenue estate of village Ghonda Gujran Khadar, Delhi arising out of AWARD NO 9/73- 74 to the land owners/ petitioner in view of the provisions of Section 24(2) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013;
- (b) To pay all benefits admissible under the law in view of the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

- c) Pass such other or further orders, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. The narration in the petition reveals that notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 ('LAA') was issued on 4th June 2009, followed by declaration under Section 6 LAA on 11th November 2009. The impugned Award No. 9/73-74 was passed on 5th June, 1973. There is no explanation in the petition for the inordinate delay in approaching the Court for relief.

3. This Court has in a series of orders following the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Mahavir v. Union of India (2018) 3 SCC 588* dismissed similar matters on account of delay and laches.

4. In that view of the matter, learned counsel for the Petitioner seeks liberty to withdraw this petition with liberty to file a fresh petition giving a proper explanation for inordinate delay in the Petitioner approaching the Court for relief.

5. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty prayed for.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

FEBRUARY 06, 2019

rd