

\$~40

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

+ **W.P.(C) 737/2018**

AJEET SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Lalit Kumar Rawal &  
Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocates

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Rajneesh Bhaskar, Govt. panel  
counsel for GNCTD

Mr. Uttam Kumar, Advocate for Respondent  
No.3/PWD

Mr. Yeeshu Jain with Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Advocates  
for Respondent/LAC/L& B

**CORAM:**

**JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR**

**JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

%

**16.01.2019**

1. The prayer in the petition reads 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 to the petitioner in respect of acquired land bearing Khasra No. 216 (01 Bigha 16 Biswas) , petitioner is having 1/8<sup>th</sup> share Situated in the Revenue Estate of Village Khajuri Khas, Shahdra Delhi arising out of Award No.912 dated 26/03/1959 . 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/alternative plots/ industrial plot/DDA flat etc. admissible under the law in view of the provisions of Right to Fair

Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

2. The narration in the petition reveals that notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 ('LAA') was issued on 26<sup>th</sup> March 1958. Subsequent to declaration under Section 6 LAA, Award No.912 was passed on 11<sup>th</sup> March 1959. This Court has in the 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.

3. 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.

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 The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty prayed for.

**S. MURALIDHAR, J.**

**SANJEEV NARULA, J.**

**JANUARY 16, 2019**

mw