

\$~34

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5358/2016**

VED PRAKASH AND ORS Petitioners
Through: Mr. Vishal Maan & Mr. Aakash
Sehrawat, Advocates

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS Respondents
Through: Ms. Ruchika Rathi, Advocate for
LAC/L & B

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

28.01.2019

1. Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

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

“i. Issue an appropriate writ, order or directions declaring the entire acquisition proceedings in respect of the land of petitioners comprised in khasra nos. 1281/1 (3-8), 1281/2 (1-8) and 1282 (4-16) total admeasuring 9 bigha 12 biswas, situated in revenue estate of Village Malikpur Kohi @ Rangpuri, New Delhi to have lapsed in view of section 24 (2) of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Re-settlement Act, 2013;

ii. Issue an appropriate Writ, Order or directions directing the respondents to initiate the proceedings in respect of the above said land afresh in accordance with the provisions of the New land Acquisition Act, 2013.

iii. Pass any further order/s that this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.”

3. Counsel for the Petitioner does not dispute that after the challenge to the land acquisition proceedings by the Petitioners in 1984 ended in a dismissal of the writ petition in 2006, the Petitioners did not challenge that order of the Court any further and it has attained finality. Thereafter, the Petitioners have to come to the Court with the present petition in 2016 after the passing of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013

4. In *Mahavir v. Union of India (2018) 3 SCC 588* the Supreme Court has observed as under:

“23. In the instant case, the claim has been made not only belatedly, but neither the petitioners nor their previous three generations had ever approached any of the authorities in writing for claiming compensation. No representation had ever been filed with any authority, none has been annexed and there is no averment made in the petition that any such representation had ever been filed. The claim appears not only stale and dead but extremely clouded. This we are mentioning as additional reasons, as such claims not only suffer from delay and laches but courts are not supposed to entertain such claims. Besides such claims become doubtful, cannot be received for consideration being barred due to delay and laches.

24. The High Court has rightly observed that such claims cannot be permitted to be raised in the court, and cannot be adjudicated as they are barred. The High Court has rightly observed that such claims cannot be a subject matter of inquiry after the lapse of a reasonable period of time and beneficial provisions of Section 24 of the 2013 Act are not available to such incumbents. In our opinion, Section 24 cannot revive those claims that are dead and stale.”

5. The above observations have been reiterated in the judgment of the three

Judge Bench in *Indore Development Authority vs. Shailendra* (2018) 3 SCC 412 where it was observed as under:-

“128. In our considered opinion section 24 cannot be used to revive the dead or stale claims and the matters, which have been contested up to this Court or even in the High Court having lost the cases or where reference has been sought for enhancement of the compensation. Compensation obtained and still it is urged that physical possession has not been taken from them, such claims cannot be entertained under the guise of section 24(2). We have come across the cases in which findings have been recorded that by which of drawing a Panchnama, possession has been taken, now again under Section 24(2) it is asserted again that physical possession is still with them. Such claims cannot be entertained in view of the previous decisions in which such plea ought to have been raised and such decisions would operate as res judicata or constructive res judicata. As either the plea raised is negatived or such plea ought to have been raised or was not raised in the previous round of litigation. Section 24 of the Act of 2013 does not supersede or annul the court’s decision and the provisions cannot be misused to reassert such claims once over again. Once Panchnama has been drawn and by way of drawing the Panchnama physical possession has been taken, the case cannot be reopened under the guise of section 24 of Act of 2013.

129. Section 24 is not intended to come to the aid of those who first deliberately refuse to accept the compensation, and then indulge in ill-advised litigation, and often ill-motivated dilatory tactics, for decades together. On the contrary, the section is intended to help those who have not been offered or paid the compensation despite it being the legal obligation of the acquiring body so to do, and/or who have been illegally deprived of their possession for five years or more; in both the scenarios, fault/cause not being attributable to the landowners/claimants.

130. We are of the view that stale or dead claims cannot be the subject-matter of judicial probing under section 24 of the Act of 2013. The provisions of section 24 do not invalidate those judgment/orders of the courts where under rights/claims have been lost/negatived,

neither do they revive those rights which have come barred, either due to inaction or otherwise by operation of law. Fraudulent and stale claims are not at all to be raised under the guise of section 24. Misuse of provisions of section 24(2) cannot be permitted. Protection by the courts in cases of such blatant misuse of the provisions of law could never have been the intention behind enacting the provisions of section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act; and, by the decision laid down in Pune Municipal Corporation (supra), and this Court never, even for a moment, intended that such cases would be received or entertained by the courts.”

6. Clearly, the Petitioners’ case is covered by the above decisions of the Supreme Court. The petition is dismissed.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

JANUARY 28, 2019

mw