

\$~48

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7699/2018**

RAVI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aman Mehrotra, Advocate.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain, Advocate for LAC
and L&B.

Mr. Meenakshi Jha, Advocate with
Mr. Singhi Dadul and Mr. Naveen
Kumar Raheja, Advocate for DDA.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

07.05.2019

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 in bearing khasra No. 27/23/2(04- 10), 49/25/2 (02-01), 49/18/1 (02-09), 23/(00-03), 52/4 (04-15), 5/1 (03-14), 54/6/2 (02-18), 241 (00-10), 488/2/2 (00-19), 490 (00-03), 501 (04-16), 502/1 (00-14), total land measuring 37 bigha 12 biswas, petitioner father extent of their 1/18th share i.e. 02 bigha 02 biswas and the petitioner relinquish his right in favour of the petitioner of the land measuring 01 bigha 01 biswas out of total land measuring 37 bigha 12 biswas through special power of attorney dated 13/6/18 (petitioner grandfather is recorded owner in revenue record) situated in the revenue estate of village Karawal Nagar, Shahdra, Delhi-arising out of Award No.29/78-79 dated 20/11/1978, Award No.125/1986-87 dated 19/09/1986 and Award No.16/83-84 dated 30/06/1983. 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.”

2. The narration in the petition reveals that the lands in question were acquired under Award Nos. 16/1983-84 and 29/78-79 passed on 30th June 1983 and 20th November 1978 respectively. There is no explanation in the petition for the inordinate delay in approaching the Court for relief.
3. 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* dismissing 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.

REKHA PALLI, J.

MAY 07, 2019/nd