

\$~44

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1453/2018**

SHRI ASHOK VIRMANI Petitioner
Through: Mr.Sanjam Chawla, Advocate

versus

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF DELHI AND ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Sumit Chander & Mr. Jatin
Chaudhary, Advocates for Respondent Nos.2 & 4
Mr. Deepak Khosla, Advocate for Respondent
Nos.5 & 50
Mr. G.P.Thareja & Mr. Satyam Thareja & Ms.
Priti Verma, Advocates for Respondent No.6
Mr. S.K.Rout and Mr. Achin Saxena, Advocates
for Respondent Nos.7, 42 & 44
Ms. Nitika Gupta, Advocate for Respondent No.25
with Respondent No.25 in person
Mr. R.K.Singh, Advocate for Respondent
Nos.8,12,15,1,17,18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 35, 36, 38, 40,
43, 45, 47, 48 & 49

CORAM:
JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR
JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
% **30.01.2019**

1. The prayers in the petition read as under:

“(a) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 to act on Representation dated 26-9-2017 and enforce the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in Meera Sahni vs. Lt. Governor of Delhi

[reported as (2008) 9 SCC 177] in the present case and declare the Sale Deeds 1 & 2 dated 8-11-2004 as void and non est in the eyes of law to the extent to which the same affect the area of the property under acquisition;

(b) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 to act upon Representation dated 26-9-2017 and issue a corrigendum to the list of interested parties in the award dated 25-8-2006;

(c) Issue a writ in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction for quashing the impugned Order dated 14-12-2017 passed by Ld. Reference Court;

(d) Issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the Ld. Reference Court to recognize the inherent rights of the Petitioner to share of the compensation for acquisition of the subject property and pass appropriate orders, and;

(e) Pass such other and further order(s) or direction(s) 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 3rd September, 2003, followed by declaration under Section 6 of the LAA on 2nd September, 2004. The impugned Award No.02/DC/(w) 2006-2007 was passed on 25th August, 2006. 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.

6. The interim order dated 14th December, 2017 as confirmed on 16th February, 2018 is hereby vacated.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

JANUARY 30, 2019

mw