

\$~14

\*

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

+

**W.P.(C) 5744/2018 & CM Appl. No. 6896/2019**

SHIV KUMAR THROUGH RAJ KUMAR ..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Akhilesh Kumar Singh &  
Mr. Saroj Kumar, Advocates

Versus

LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR & ORS. .... Respondents

Through Mr. Yeeshu Jain & Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,  
Advocates for Respondent/LAC/  
L & B  
Ms. Nidhi Mohan Parashar and M.A.  
Aruneshi for UOI  
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Sanjay  
Singh for DDA

**CORAM:**

**JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR**

**JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

**27.02.2019**

%

1. The prayers in the present petition read as under:

“a) set aside the impugned award i.e. 10/2008-2009 (SW) passed by the Office of the ADM/LAC(SW) Room No. 12, Old Terminal Tax Building, Kapashera, New Delhi-110037 against plot bearing N0.8-A, area measuring 103 Sq. yds. out of Khasra No. 140/3/1, situated in the Revenue Estate of Village Dhichaun Kalan, Delhi State Delhi in the abadi now known as Laxmi Vihar, Najafgarh, New Delhi..

b) further directions to the Respondents to initiate fresh land acquisition proceedings as per the new enactment.

c) Further directions to grant compensation as per the new law by consideration of the market value of the land by setting-aside the prior award which was passed under the old Act.

d) pass any other or further order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.”

2. The background facts are that land in question i.e. Plot No. 8-A in Khasra No. 140/3/1 (103 Sq. yards) located in the revenue estate of Village Dichaun Kalan was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act (LAA), 1894 on 7<sup>th</sup> April, 2006.

3. This was followed by declaration under Section 6 of LAA on 4<sup>th</sup> April, 2007 that the land was required for the public purpose of “construction of 100 metres in under planned development of Delhi”. The Land Acquisition Collector (LAC) passed the impugned Award No. 10/2008-2009 on 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2008.

4. The DDA in its counter affidavit states, physical possession of acquired land i.e. Khasra No. 140/3/1 min.(5-10) out of total area measuring 5 Bigha 17 Biswa of Village Dichaun Kalan, New Delhi has been handed over to the respondent-Delhi Development Authority by the LAC/Land and Building Department, Govt. of NCT of Delhi on 10.02.2012 “for the purpose of 100 meter road NHAI.” It is further submitted that the petitioners have no ownership documents nor copy from revenue records to prove their title or ownership in respect of the land and thus, they have failed to connect themselves with the land and have no *locus standi* to challenge the acquisition proceeding. It is further submitted that payment of

comepensation in respect of Award No. 10/2008-09 was released to the concerned L&B Department.

5. As far as the Petitioner is concerned, it is stated in the petition that he is “the owner of the property/plot No. 8A area measuring 103 sq.yards of Khasra No. 140/3/1 in the area of Village Dichaon Kalan, Delhi “in the abadi now known as Laxmi Nagar, Najafgarh, New Delhi”.

6. Enclosed as Annexure P-2 collectively are ‘the sale documents’It is pertinent to mention that the petitioner Shiv Kumar has been sold the acquire land which falls in Khasra No. 140/3/1(1-03) through General Power of Attorney. on 28<sup>th</sup> March 1998. Apart from this not being a valid interest instrument for transfer of title, it appears that the Petitioner, having full knowledge of the status of the land in question, and without taking permission from the competent authority, in terms of the Delhi Land (Restriction of Transfer) Act, 1972 entered into the said transaction. There is merit in the contention of the DDA that the said transaction is void and does not bind the Government in any manner. The original recorded owner, who obviously is not the Petitioner, has not challenged the land acquisition proceedings.

7. In para 3 of the writ petition, the Petitioner states that in May, 2009 the officials of the Land and Building (L&B) Department informed him that the land had been acquired and compensation for the same was being paid to the recorded owners. According to the Petitioner he submitted the requisite documents to the LAC regarding the payment of compensation. The

Petitioner claims that after passing of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 ('2013 Act'), he is entitled to the relief under Section 24 (2) thereof since no compensation has been paid to him and the physical possession of the land in question remains with him. Further, the date of passing of the Award is more than five years prior to 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2014 i.e. the date of the 2013 Act coming into force.

8. No rejoinder has been filed by the Petitioner to the counter affidavit filed by the DDA.

9. In the course of the hearing, it transpired that Laxmi Nagar in Village Dichaon Kalan is one of the unauthorized colonies in respect of which a provisional regularization certificate has been issued. On the website of the Department of Urban Development of the GNCTD, the complete list of unauthorized colonies in respect of which tentative application forms and tentative layout plans had been submitted and which are awaiting regularization has been put up. Laxmi Nagar is one of those unauthorized colonies, which figures at S.No.912. Clearly, therefore, the property in question forms part of the unauthorized colony.

10. This Court has in a series of orders, consistently held that where the property in question is part of an unauthorized colony, no relief under Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act can be granted. The legal position has been summarized by the Court in a decision dated 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2019 in W.P.(C) No.4528/2015 (*Mool Chand v. Union of India*) where it was held in

paragraphs 48, 49 and 50 as under:

“48. The third aspect of the case is that the Petitioner admits that the land in question is part of an unauthorised colony. The very basis for seeking regularisation of an unauthorised colony is that it is located on land which belongs either to the public or to some other private parties. The Petitioners would therefore not have the locus standi to seek a declaration in terms of Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act in such cases since the very fact that they have sought regularisation on the basis that they are in unauthorised colony would be an admission that they do not otherwise have any valid right, title or interest in the land in question.

49. This Court has by order dated 19th December 2018 in WP(C) No.190/2016 (*Harbhagwan Batra v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi*) and order dated 8th January 2019 in WP(C) No.10201/2015 (*Gurmeet Singh Grewal v. Union of India*) negatived similar pleas by the Petitioners who were trying to seek similar declaration of lapsing even while admitting that they were pursuing regularisation of an unauthorised colony.

50. In a decision dated 10th January 2019 in W.P. (C) 3623 of 2018 (*Akhil Sibal v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi*) this Court observed in this context as under:

“18. The Court at this stage may also observe that many of the unauthorized colonies are awaiting regularization orders. A large portion of these colonies are by way of encroachment on public land, some of it may be on private land, but in any event, the constructions themselves are unauthorized. The major premise on which such regularization is sought is that these constructions have been erected on public or private land which does not belong to the persons who are under occupation of those structures. That very basis gets contradicted as some of them try to seek a declaration about lapsing of the land acquisition proceedings by invoking Section 24 (2) of

the 2013 Act. This is a contradiction in terms and is legally untenable.”

11. The above decision has been followed and the legal position has been reiterated by this Court in an order dated 25<sup>th</sup> January, 2019 in W.P.(C) No.3438/2015 (*Krishna Devi v. Union of India*). As clarified in those orders, the dismissal of the present petition will not come in the way of the Petitioner pursuing the claim for regularisation of the unauthorised colony in question.

12. Consequently, the reliefs prayed for in the petition cannot be granted. The writ petition is dismissed. The interim order dated 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018 as confirmed on 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2018 is hereby vacated. The applications are also disposed of.

**S. MURALIDHAR, J.**

**SANJEEV NARULA, J.**

**FEBRUARY 27, 2019**

mw