

\$~47

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6795/2018**

LAXMAN SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Lalit K.Rawal, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing Counsel
with Ms.Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate for
L&B/LAC.

Ms.Mrinalini Sen, Standing Counsel
for DDA with Mr.Tanmay Yadav,
Advocate.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

22.01.2019

%

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 acquired land in respect of land of the petitioner father of the petitioner i.e. Ratte Ram is recorded owner of the agricultural land of bearing Khasra No. 1/43/2 (00-16), 1/64 (08-08), 1/65 (05-18) 1/66 (01-18) 1/67 (12-12), 1/68(01-18) total land measuring 31 Bigha 07 Biswas in petitioner extent 1/12th share i.e. (02-16) out of total land measuring 31 Bigha 07 Biswas (the petitioner father is Recorded owner in Revenue Record) Situated in the Revenue Estate of Village. Ziauddinpur, Shahdara, Delhi- arising out of Award No.1954 dated 27/02/1967. In view of the provisions of Section 24(2) of Right of Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

b. To pay all benefits/alternative plots/industrial plot/DDA Flat

etc. as per revenue record admissible under the law in view of the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. Any other and further relief which this Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper under the circumstances of the case may also be allowed in favour of the Petitioner.”

2. The narration in the petition reveals that notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 ('LAA') was issued on 24th October 1961 followed by declaration under Section 6 LAA on 1st August 1966. The impugned Award No.1954 was passed on- 27th February 1967. 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 leave to withdraw this petition with liberty to file a fresh petition giving the proper explanation for inordinate delay in the Petitioner approaching the Court for relief.

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 The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

JANUARY 22, 2019

mw