

\$~2 to 41 & 57 to 67

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7757/2018**

R. L. KHULLAR REP. AS LRS OF LATE SMT. PRAKASH KHULLAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vijay Kumar and Mr. Thomas
Oommen, Advocates.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.

WITH

+ **W.P.(C) 8111/2018**

GEETA MITTAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 8115/2018**

SANJAY TANDON

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Kushagra Pandey, Panel Counsel
for GNCTD (Civil)/R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8119/2018**
JYOTSNA NAGAR Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Shekhar Kumar, Advocate for R-
1.
Mr. Sachin Naha, Advocate for R-1,
Secretary, Urban
Development/GNCTD.

+ **W.P.(C) 8121/2018**
SUNITA DEVI Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika

Gupta, Advocates for DDA.

+

W.P.(C) 8130/2018

MOHAN SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Raghuvendra Pandey, Advocate
for GNCTD.

+

W.P.(C) 8134/2018

BHAGWAT PARSAD

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.
Mr. Mohit Agarwal, Advocate for R-
1/GNCTD.

+

W.P.(C) 8135/2018

YOGESH KAPOOR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.
Mr. Abhinav Singh and Mr. Mohd.
Kaisar Ansari, Advocates for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8136/2018**
MAHENDER SINGH Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.
Mr. T.S. Nanda, Advocate for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8153/2018**
ASHOK KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.
Mr. Samaksh Goyal, Advocate for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8156/2018**
LAXMI DEVI Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Shekhar Kumar, Advocate for R-
1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8161/2018**
SHANKAR DASS Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 8166/2018**
OM PARKASH SOBTI Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Shlok Chandra and Mr. Ritesh
Kumar Sharma, Advocates for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8168/2018**
KRISHNA DUGGAL Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.
Ms. Anya Singh, Advocate for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8169/2018**
VIDYA WATI Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 8170/2018**
PUSHPA SINGH REP. AS LR. OF LATE SIRINIWAS SINGH
..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika

Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Ms. Barnali Basak, Advocate for R-1/GNCTD.

+

W.P.(C) 8366/2018

GHANSHYAM SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.
Mr. Rizwan and Mr. Jatin Ghuliani,
Advocates for R-1/GNCTD.

+

W.P.(C) 8367/2018

SHASHI BALA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Pramod Kumar, Mr. Shajev Khan
and Mr. Prabhash Kumar, Advocates
for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8384/2018

RADHEY SHYAM SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Advocate for DDA.

+

W.P.(C) 8404/2018

SANTOSH KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Rizwan and Mr. Jatin Ghuliani,
Advocates for R-1/GNCTD.

+

W.P.(C) 8476/2018

SANJAY SANKLA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.

+

W.P.(C) 8477/2018

LAJWANTI DEVI Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. T.S. Nanda, Advocate for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8478/2018

NARENDER KUMAR SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Ms. Anya Singh, Advocate for R-
1/GNCTD.

+

W.P.(C) 8498/2018

GORSHARAN SINGH REP AS LRS OF LATE SH. GIAN SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,

Advocates for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 8500/2018**
INDERJEET SETH Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 8501/2018**
VINOD KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 8502/2018**
SHAKUNTLA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.

Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. T.S. Nanda, Advocate for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8510/2018

PREM VATI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Ashish Uppal, Advocate for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8528/2018

CHANDER PAL BAIRWA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. V.P. Nahar, Advocate for R-1,
Secretary, GNCTD, Urban
Development.

+

W.P.(C) 8529/2018

DURGA DEVI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Mohit Agarwal, Advocate for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8539/2018

SHYAM KAPOOR REP AS LR OF LATE SUNITA KUMARI Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Ms. Shefali Vohra, Advocate for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8605/2018

KAMLESH KUMARI AS LRS OF LATE SH SATYA SINGH Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,

Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Chirag Madan, Ms. Ravleen
Sabharwal and Mr. G Sai Krishna
Kumar, Advocates for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8606/2018

SHAMA JAIN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Abhishek Kr. Singh, Advocate
for R-1.

+

W.P.(C) 8607/2018

PREM CHAND

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Mr. Sanjay Singh
and Mr. Ajay Birbal, Advocates for
DDA.

+

W.P.(C) 8608/2018

S P MAHAJAN AS LRS OF LATE CHANDER MOHINI Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Mr. Sanjay Singh
and Mr. Ajay Birbal, Advocates for
DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 8609/2018**
PRABHU LAL Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal, Mr. Sanjay Singh
and Mr. Ajay Birbal, Advocates for
DDA.
Mr. Mananjay Mishra, Advocate for
R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8610/2018**
PAWAN KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Mayank Bamniyal and
Ms. Mallika Ahluwalia, Advocates

for R-1.
Mr. Jagdeep Kr. Sharma with
Mr. Deepankur Sondhi, Advocates for
R-2/DDA.

+

W.P.(C) 8612/2018

VINAY DUA AS LRS OF LATE ASHWANI KUMAR Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.

Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.

Mr. Aditya Singhal and Mr. Rajesh
Sharma, Advocates for R-1 and R-3.

+

W.P.(C) 8616/2018

VEENA JAIN Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.

Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.

Ms. Saumya Tandan, Advocate for R-
1/GNCTD.

+

W.P.(C) 8617/2018

PEEYUSH AGGARWAL Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Priyaranjan Dubey and Mr.
Pankaj Yadav, Advocates for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 8620/2018**

GULAB SINGH GOEL Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Dr. Ashwini Bhardwaj, Advocate for
UOI.

+ **W.P.(C) 7728/2018**

N. S. PILLAI Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika

Gupta, Advocates for DDA.

+

W.P.(C) 7739/2018

PRAKASH CHAND MISHRA REP AS LR OF LATE RAM DEVI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.

+

W.P.(C) 7767/2018

DINESH TIWARI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Kaustubh Anshuraj and
Mr. Pankaj Mehta, Advocates for R-
1.

+

W.P.(C) 7768/2018

RANJIT SINGHA AS LRS OF LATE AMAR SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen and Ms. Kritika
Gupta, Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Pramod Kumar, Mr. Shajev Khan
and Mr. Prabhash Kumar, Advocates
for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 7769/2018**
FAIZUR RAHMAN Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.

+ **W.P.(C) 7770/2018**
KUSMAKAR SOOD Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Pawan Mathur, Advocate for
DDA.
Mr. Prateek Dahiya, Advocate for R-
1.

+ **W.P.(C) 7771/2018**
KISHAN CHAND ARORA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus
GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Samaksh Goyal, Advocate for R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 7772/2018**
NEERU NAGAR Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus
GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. A.K. Pandey and Ms. L.H Dutta,
Advocates for R-1 & R-3.

+ **W.P.(C) 7773/2018**
SURINDER PAL SINGH Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Ajay Birbal,
Advocates for DDA.
Mr. Mohd. Irshad and Mr. Nadeem
Saifi, Advocates for R-State.

+ **W.P.(C) 7774/2018**
SURAJ BHAN SINGH Petitioner
Through: Mr. Thomas Oommen, Advocate.
versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain and Ms. Jyoti Tyagi,
Advocates for LAC/L&B.
Mr. Jagdeep Kr. Sharma, ASC with
Mr. Deepankur Sondhi, Advocates for
R-2.
Mr. Raghuvendra Pandey, Advocate
for R-GNCTD.

CORAM:
JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR
JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

JUDGMENT
% **21.02.2019**

Dr. S. Muralidhar, J.:

1. These 51 petitions arise out of a similar set of facts and involve a common issue and are accordingly being disposed of collectively. Nevertheless, the petitions were heard separately.

2. These separate petitions came to be filed after this Court had passed an order on 29th May 2018 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 5961/2018 (***Surender Pal Singh & Ors. v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors.***).

3. For the sake of convenience, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 7757/2018 (***R.L. Khullar v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors***) is treated as the lead matter and the averments therein are referred to.

4. The Petitioner, Mr. Khullar, claims that he is the owner of Plot No. 34, area 440 sq. yds in Khasra No. 392/264 situated in Ashok Nagar of Village Chillar Saroda Bangar, Delhi now known as B-Block, New Ashok Nagar, Delhi- 96. It is stated that he possessed the said property through registered sale deeds dated 12th July 1971. He states that in 1980, an Association was formed by individuals, including the Petitioner, who had purchased various plots in the same locality and had constructed buildings/structures there. The said Association was known as the “Ashok Nagar Welfare Association” (hereafter ‘Association’).

5. On 17th November 1980, a notification was issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (LAA) for the purposes of acquisition of a large tract of land in Village Chilla Saroda Bangar, Delhi for the planned development of Delhi. Admittedly, the said notification included lands in Khasra Nos. 391/263, 392/264, 393/264 and 402/268. The declaration under Section 6 LAA was issued on 29th September 1981 followed by Award No.39/82-83 on 30th September 1982.

6. Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1507/1984 was filed by the Ashok Nagar Welfare Association in this Court challenging the aforementioned land acquisition proceedings on the ground that there was no publicity given to the notice under Section 4 LAA or declaration under Section 6 LAA, and in any event individual notices under Section 9 (3) of the LAA were not given to the members of the aforementioned Association thereby depriving them of the opportunity of objecting to the acquisition proceedings under Section 5A of the LAA. Enclosed with the writ petition as Annexure P8 is a copy of the judgment dated 21st May, 1998 by the Division Bench of this Court dismissing CWP No. 1507/1984 (*Ashok Nagar Welfare Association v. Union of India*). The Court is informed that the Special Leave Petition (C) 10510 of 1998 filed against the said judgment was dismissed by the Supreme Court of India on 6th July, 1998. Another W.P. (C) 265 of 2001 filed in this Court claiming similar relief came to be dismissed by this Court on 8th May 2003.

7. The same Ashok Nagar Welfare Association filed civil suits against private parties alleged unauthorized occupation by them of land in Khasra No. 391/263. Suit No. 1066 of 1990 filed in this Court was transferred to the Court of the District Judge and re-numbered as Suit No. 222 of 1998. This suit was decreed ex parte on 6th January 1999. After the Association filed Execution Petition No. 74 of 1999 for executing the said decree, the DDA woke up and filed an application under Order IX Rule 13 CPC for setting aside the ex parte decree. That application was dismissed by the civil court on 23rd July, 2005. DDA then filed CM (M) No. 1558 of 2007 in this Court.

8. Another suit being Suit No. 649 of 1990 was filed in respect of Plot Nos. 66 to 120, 157 to 162 and 208 to 212 comprised in Khasra Nos. 391/263. The Association in this plaint contended that it was the owner and in physical possession of 141 bighas and 15 biswas in Khasra Nos. 391/263, 392/264, 393/264 and 402/268. This suit was dismissed on 7th January 2003. The appeal against the said dismissal, being RCA No. 3 of 2005, was dismissed as withdrawn after recording the statement of the President of the Association that the aforementioned plots falling in Khasra No. 391/263 had merged in the changing road due to construction of a new bridge over the Hindon canal and that possession of the land across the road had been taken over by GAIL and the Irrigation Department.

9. As regards the land in Khasra No.393/264 in Ashok Nagar of Village Chilla Saroda Bangar, Delhi, the said Association filed two separate suits viz., Suit No. 544 of 1991 and 597 of 1991. The prayer in the said suit was for decree of possession/restoration of possession in respect of the aforementioned property admeasuring 13 bighas 14 biswas out of 141 bighas 15 biswas falling in Khasra No. 393/264. It appears that an ex-parte decree was passed in favour of the Plaintiff by the Additional District Judge in yet another Suit No. 312/1993 on 9th July 1997. Pursuant thereto, the said Ashok Nagar Welfare Association had purportedly sought to take possession by filing Execution Petitions.

10. Pursuant to the ex-parte decree dated 6th January 1999 in Suit No. 222/1998, the Association took police help to take possession of land that formed the subject matter of the suit in October 2005, by breaking the

boundary wall of DDA. The stand of the DDA was that the land taken over was in fact land which forms subject matter of Suit No. 649/02/1990 which has already been dismissed and the appeal against the same by the Association had also been dismissed.

11. The East End Apartments Cooperative Group Housing Society filed Writ Petition (Civil) 3326/2006 in this Court for a declaration that the Association had no right, title or interest in land in Khasra No. 391/263 in view of the aforementioned land acquisition proceedings. An order was passed by the Division Bench of this Court on 7th March 2006 restraining the Association from raising any construction over the land in question.

12. On 12th November 2007, a statement was made on behalf of the Association that it is ready to hand over the possession of whatsoever extent of land that was in its possession and that the Court may direct a proper inquiry. However, on 14th November 2007, the President of Association, Mr. Mohan Singh, backtracked on the above statement and despite assurances, failed to surrender possession. A detailed statement was recorded by Mr. Mohan Singh by the Registrar General of this Court. He failed to furnish the details of the 85 proceedings instituted by him in various Courts.

13. On 14th November 2007, the Court took on record a copy of the letter of allotment in respect of the disputed area issued by the DDA to Delhi Metro Railway Corporation (DMRC). Pursuant to the orders of the Court, DMRC took over possession of the certain portions of the land for the construction of a metro station.

14. After the land was handed over to the DMRC for construction of the metro station, the Association filed one more petition being W.P. (C) No. 311 of 2008 claiming itself to be the legal owner of the land in Khasra No. 391/263 and sought a mandamus to the DDA and DMRC not to interfere with its peaceful possession of the remaining land. In the present petition it is sought to be alleged that “the DMRC in collusion with the DDA forcefully took over possession from Association members by illegal demolition, against which the Association filed W.P.(C) 311 of 2008 for restoration of possession against DMRC and DDA.”

15. The said W.P. (C) 3326/2006 filed by East End Apartments Cooperative Group Housing Society Ltd. was heard along with W.P. (C) 311 of 2008 and CM (M) No. 1558 of 3007 by the DDA and disposed of by the Division Bench of this Court by a common judgment dated 27th November 2008. The operative directions read as under:

“34. In the present case the plaintiff Association filed a series of writ petitions in this court challenging the acquisition and all those writ petitions were dismissed. In spite of dismissal of the writ petitions the Association has kept on filing the suits under section 6 against private parties and obstruction the course of justice after this Court dismissed the CWP No. 1507/1984. In our opinion, this prima facie amounts to a criminal contempt as laid down In *Advocate General, State of Bihar v. Madhya Pradesh Khair Industries and Anr.* (1980 3 SCC 311), *Bloom Dekor Limited v. Subhash Himatlal Desai & Ors.* (1994) 6 SCC 322 and *Delhi Development Authority v. Skipper Construction* (1995) 3 SCC 567. This is not a case of a stray act but deliberate repetitive acts of filing series of suits with a view to grab the land which has been vested in the State Government more than 25 years

back. The conduct of the plaintiff Association tends to bring the authority and administration of justice into disrepute and even disregard. It also tends to seriously affect the rights of the parties in the litigation, which is seen from the fact that the plaintiff Association managed to get possession of DDA land by resorting to dubious methods.

35. In the light of the foregoing discussion, we pass the following orders:

(i) CM(M) No. 1558/2007 is allowed and the impugned decree dated 6th January, 1999 and the order dated 23rd July, 2005 dismissing the application under Order IX Rule 13 CPC are quashed and set aside. Suit No.222/1998 is dismissed and the execution proceedings in Execution No. 74/99 (now Execution No. 18/04) are also dismissed. Mr.Mohan Singh shall pay the cost of CM(M) to the DDA, quantified at Rs.10 lacs. The costs shall be payable within a period of eight weeks from today failing which the DDA is at liberty to recover the same in accordance with law.

(ii) Registry is directed to ascertain the status of the various proceedings mentioned in paragraph 19 of the judgment and all these proceedings which are pending as of date before the courts subordinate to this court shall stand withdrawn to this court and be placed before this Bench on 15th December, 2008 for passing further orders. In the meantime, Ashok Nagar Welfare Association, Mahakaleshwar Welfare Society and Mr. Mohan Singh, who is claiming to be the President of these societies, are restrained from filing/Instituting or initiating any proceedings, whether civil or criminal, respect of 141 Bighas and 15 Biswas of land any any other land which forms the subject matter Award No. 2982-83 dated 30th September, 1982.

(iii) Criminal case filed by Mr. Mohan Singh being Criminal Case NO. 1346/2008 shall also be withdrawn to this Court and be placed before this Court on 15th December, 2008.

(iv) Let the Registry issue a notice to Mr. Mohan Singh s/o Mr.

M.L. Singh, without process fee, to show cause as to why he should not be punished for contempt of court for the following acts:

(a) Procuring a decree in Suit No. 222/1998 (Suit No. 1066/1990) by suppressing the fact that the writ petition of the plaintiff Association was dismissed and status quo vacated, and

(b) Repeatedly filing suits and proceedings in respect of Khasra No. 301/263, 292/264, 393/264 and 402/268 in spite of the fact that possession of the said land was taken pursuant to the award No. 39/82-83 and the land stood vested in the State Government and the petitions filed by the plaintiff Association were dismissed by the High Court were confirmed by the Supreme Court.

(v) DMRC is free to proceed with the construction of the Metro Station in the land allotted by the DDA in terms of the orders dated 20th December, 2007 and 4th January, 2008 and the DMRC will be free to deal with the said land in terms of the letter of allotment and the restriction regarding the user of the land placed by the orders dated 4th January, 2008 stands withdrawn.

(vi) In view of the above directions, no further orders are necessary in Writ Petition (C) No. 3326/2006 and the same stands disposed of.

(vii) Writ Petition (C) No. 311/2008 is hereby dismissed Mr. Mohan Singh shall pay the cost of Rs. 2.5 lacs each to DDA and DMRC. The cost shall be payable within a period of eight weeks from today falling which the DDA and DMRC will be entitled to recover the same from the Mr. Mohan Singh in accordance with law. The documents contained in the sealed cover be placed before this Court on the next date.”

16. The matter did not end there. Pursuant to the directions issued by the Court regarding proceedings against Mr. Mohan Singh for contempt of

Court, a further judgment was passed by the Division Bench on 21st May 2009 recording the undertaking of Mr. Mohan Singh that he would withdraw all proceedings instituted by him in Courts, both Civil and Criminal. This was by way of an affidavit dated 20th May 2009 by Mr. Mohan Singh where inter alia he stated in para 3 as under:

“3. That I seek to withdraw on the cases pending in any court, including criminal cases, filed by me as President of Ashok Nagar Welfare Association as well as individually by me. That the cases which have been filed in the name of Mahakaleshwar Welfare Association are also been sought to be withdrawn. I further undertake that I shall neither file any case against DDA or the DMRC nor would be instrumental in filing any case against DDA or DMRC or anyone else as regards to land kalling in Khasra No. 391/263, 392/264, 393/264 and 402/268 situated in the Revenue Estate of New Ashok Nagar of Village Cbilla Saroda Banger, Delhi. I further state that case against DDA or DMRC.”

17. In its judgment dated 21st May 2009 while taking the above affidavit on record, this Court observed in para 23 as under:

“23. Though we are discharging the notice of contempt, we must express our anguish at the attempt of the contemnor and the Ashok Nagar Welfare Association on soiling the purity of the stream of justice which has to be kept clear and pure at all times. No one, can be permitted to undermine the dignity of the Court and interfere with the due course of judicial proceedings or administration of justice. The contemnor and the Association which he represents will be strictly bound by the undertaking/affidavit filed by them in this Court. Nothing further survives in the present proceedings and the same are accordingly disposed of in terms of what is stated hereinabove. All pending applications stand disposed of as well. It is ordered accordingly.”

18. Notwithstanding the above, the Petitioner now seeks to characterise the

entire litigation involving W.P (C) No. 3326/2007 as having been filed by “third party in collusion with the DDA for setting aside the ex-parte decree dated 06.01.1999.” He contends that “Even at the relevant time the Association Members were not ready to file the undertakings in the Contempt Proceedings, and therefore, withdrew the powers of the than President of the association, who under the pain of Contempt, succumbed to the directions of this Hon'ble Court and filed an Affidavit on 20.5.2009 but it was not accepted and another Affidavit was directed to be filed which was duly filed on same day after lunch.”

19. In Para 25 of the writ petition, it has been stated as under:-

“25. The Petitioner submits that it was subsequent development that on 04.09.2012 the Government of NCT, Delhi vide orders No. F.No.1.33/UC/UD/Policy/2012/549-553 dated 04.09.2012 regularized the colonies / lands of which the Petitioner were owners and which lands have been subject matter of the acquisition. Copy of order of Delhi Government dated 04.09.2012 and photographs showing that are is fully developed and, thus, possession was never taken by DDA are annexed herewith as Annexure P-16 Colly.”

20. Thus, there is clear and unequivocal admission by the Petitioner that the entire area and the land comprising of structures in which the Petitioner is claiming an interest in, is part of an unauthorised colony. It is accordingly claimed in Para 25 of the petition that the DDA was never in possession of land in question and the whole purpose of acquisition stood defeated.

21. Interestingly, this very contention was earlier noticed in the judgment dated 27th November 2008 passed by this Court in Writ Petition (Civil)

3326/2006 as under:

“9. The plaintiff Association then initiated a third round of litigation in this Court by filing W.P.(C) No. 6568/98 praying for quashing of the award dated 30th September 1982 on the ground that DDA had abandoned the award by initiating proceedings for regularization of the unauthorized colony on the land. A learned Single Judge of this Court dismissed this writ petition vide order dated 13th September 2000 holding that the issue was covered by the earlier judgment dated 21st May 1998 in CWP No. 1507/84. Against the said order of the learned Single Judge, LPA No. 15/2001 was filed by the plaintiff Association which came to be dismissed by the Division Bench on 15th October, 2001 SLP(C) No. 4072/2002 preferred by the Association which came to be dismissed as withdrawn by the Supreme Court by order dated 31st January 2003.”

22. In Para 29 of the present petition, a reference is made to yet another W.P (C) No. 5952/2007 stated to have been filed by one Mr. T.K. Chaudhary in which the following facts emerged:-

“4. Note of DDA dt. June 2005 with relevant portion of list of colonies proves that a meeting was held on 6.6.2005 on the subject of Regularization of unauthorized colonies and the name of the Petitioner colony was shown at serial no.846.

5. On 27.4.2007, a Minister circulated list of colonies as Annex.- II, provided by Respondent DDA which shows that the land subject matter of above writ petition was declared 'development area' by DDA, which conclusively means that area in question was already developed and peoples were residing there. Petitioner colony shown at sl. Nos. 145-146.

6. 'Provisional Regularization Certificates' dt. 17.9.2008 were issued to the colony New Ashok Nagar, Delhi-92.

7. Application dt.28.12.2004 showing that colony is in existence since 1972-73.

8. That the letter dt.31.5.2013 issued by the Respondent DDA itself proves that the land subject matter of the present petition has been denotified and has been transferred to the MCD.”

“Copy of extract of the Reconstituted Committee of unapproved colony was held on 23.10.84, letter of MCD dt.9.4.87, letter of DESU dt. 1.6.1987 showing that colony is in existence since 1981 which itself falsify/ the stand of DDA that possession of the land was taken on 1.10.1982, letter of BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. dt.26.8.2002 proves that B Block, Ashok Nagar, Delhi has been electrified. Note of DDA dt. June 2005 on the subject Regularization of unauthorized colonies with relevant portion of list of colonies. Copy of Annex.-II provided by Respondent DDA circulated by a Minister on 27.4.2007 with relevant portion of list of colonies which shows that the said colony is within the "Development area" and Provisional Regularization Certificate dt. 17.9.2008 issued to the colony New Ashok Nagar, Delhi-92 and application dt.28.12.2004 showing that colony is in existence since 1972- 73 and letter dt.31.5.2013 issued by DDA are annexed herewith and marked as Annexure P-17 colly.”

23. Therefore, there is an acknowledgement at more than one place in the present writ petition that the entire subject matter of land forms part of an unauthorised colony which has been issued a Provisional Regularisation Certificate only on 17th September 2008.

24. The Petitioner then goes on to refer to the fact that the 2013 Act became operational on 1st January 2014. It is stated that “The Petitioner further submits that no possession of lands of the Petitioner was taken and the Petitioner happens to be in constructive possession of the said lands.” It is also claimed that no compensation has been paid and therefore the Petitioner is entitled to declaration in terms of Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act.

25. The main plank of the petition is an order dated 14th March 2018 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 4494/2015 (*Somanti Devi Verma v. Govt. of NCT Delhi*) whereby in respect of a portion that stood acquired under the same Award No. 39/82-83 dated 30th September 1982, a declaration of deemed lapsing of land acquisition proceedings was issued by this Court.

26. The Court has perused a copy of the said order dated 14th March 2018 in W.P. (C) No. 4494/2015 and notices that although it is in respect of acquisition proceedings pertaining to land in Khasra Nos. 392/264, 393/264 and 402/268 in Revenue Estate of Village Chilla Saroda Bangar, the Court granted the declaration of deemed lapsing of proceedings only to the extent of Khasra No. 402/268. Unfortunately, the said order does not notice the history of the litigation as noted hereinbefore. The limited relief in respect of Khasra No. 402/268 was granted on the erroneous basis that “neither physical possession of the subject land has been taken nor compensation has been paid to the petitioners.” Yet, the Court has clarified that “We have not expressed any opinion on the title of the above land. The question of title of the subject land is left open to be decided in the appropriate court of jurisdiction.”

27. The averments in the other connected writ petitions are near identical and therefore need not be set out. The Court has heard the submissions of the learned counsels for the parties.

28. There were several difficulties in the way of the Petitioners being granted the relief prayed for in the present petitions. First, is the fact that the lands are part of an unauthorised colony in respect of which the Provisional Regularisation Certificate admittedly had been issued on 17th September 2008.

29. This Court has in a series of orders consistently held that land which forms part of unauthorised colony which is awaiting regularisation will not qualify for relief under Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act. In its judgment dated 17th January 2019 in Writ Petition (Civil) 4528/2015 (***Mool Chand v. Union of India***), the Court observed 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***) negated 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.”

30. Consequently, on this ground alone, the reliefs prayed for in the present petitions cannot be granted.

31. The Court notices that the order dated 14th March 2018 in Writ Petition (C) 4494/20015 does not advert to this aspect at all. Also, the said order did not take note of the observations of the three- Judge Bench of Supreme Court in its judgment dated 8th February 2018 in ***Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra (2018) 3 SCC 412*** which specifically adverted to the fact that the relief under Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act is not available for the revival of “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”. The following observations in the said judgment are pertinent in the present case:

“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.”

32. Mr. Vijay Kumar, learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted that the correctness of the aforementioned judgment in ***Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra***(supra) is pending consideration before the

Constitution Bench of Supreme Court. This very contention has been negative by this Court in the in *Mool Chand v. Union of India* (*supra*). This Court noted in the said decision that what has been referred by the Constitution Bench in *Indore Development Authority v. Shyam Verma* (2018) 3 SCC 405 are two issues. One concerns the difference of opinion in the decisions in *Pune Municipal Corporation v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki* (2014) 3 SCC 183 and *Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra* (*supra*) on the aspect of tendering of compensation. The second is the difference arising out of the decisions in *Yogesh Neema v. State of Madhya Pradesh* (2016) 6 SCC 387 and *Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu* (2015) 3 SCC 353 as regards exclusion of the period covered by the interim orders for the purpose of calculation of the period of five years under Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act. In the decision of this Court in *Mool Chand* (*supra*), this has been explained thus:

“36. Relevant to the issue on hand, there was no difference of view *qua* Question III addressed in *Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra* (*supra*) i.e. “Whether section 24 of Act of 2013 revives barred and stale claims?” On this question there was no view (much less a contrary view) expressed in *Pune Municipal Corporation* (*supra*) or for that matter in any other subsequent decision of a smaller, co-ordinate or even larger Bench of the Supreme Court. This question, therefore, was not the subject matter of reference before the Constitution Bench.

37. Consequently, this Court is of the view that although the order passed by the Constitution Bench refers to “all the aspects” being considered by the Constitution Bench, that expression would not include questioning the correctness of the decision of the three-Judge Bench in *Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra* (*supra*) as far as it holds by a unanimous opinion that Section 24 (2) of the 2013 Act cannot revive old and stale

claims.”

33. The Court finds that the present petitions manifest yet another abuse of the process of law by the persons who earlier had unsuccessfully petitioned this Court either by themselves or through the Association to get the land released from land acquisition proceedings. They have sought to take one more chance after the enactment of the 2013 Act in clear breach of the solemn undertakings earlier given in this Court.

34. For all the aforementioned reasons, Court finds no merit in any of these petitions and they are dismissed as such.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

FEBRUARY 21, 2019

SS