

\$~22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 7893/2017**

TEJ SINGH & ORS. Petitioners

Through: Mr.Arun Kumar Kaushik, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr.Sanjay Kumar Pathak,
Mr.K.Pathak, Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha &
Mr. M.S.Akhtar, Advocates for
Respondent/LAC/L & B Deptt.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen, Standing counsel with
Mr. Tanmay Yadav, Advocates for
Respondent/DDA

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
31.01.2019

%

1. The prayer in the petition read as under:

“a. Pass any appropriate writ, order and/or direction thereby declaring the entire acquisition proceedings, in respect of and in relation to the petitioners' land being 1/8 joint share in Khasra no 252/1(2-0), 253(2-6), 254(3-14), 258/1(2-16), 257(4-18), 259(1-10), 260(2-8), 262(2-0), 312(2-12), 313(2-2). Total measuring 26 Bighas 6 Biswas, situated in the revenue estate of Village, Kotla Mahigram, Delhi, as deemed to have been lapsed in view of the right to fair compensation and land acquisition and rehabilitation and resettlement act, 2013 and further issue order or direction quashing the impugned award no. 205/1986-87 of Village Kotla Mahigram thereby the aforesaid land belonging to the petitioners or their predecessor in interest was acquired;

b. Pass such other or further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

2. The narration in the petition reveals that notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 ('LAA') was issued on 6th April, 1964, followed by declaration under Section 6 of the LAA on 7th December, 1966. The impugned Award No.205/1986-87 was passed in the year 1986-87. 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 dismissed matters on account of delay and laches. The above observations have been followed by this Court in several orders including the order dated 10th January, 2019 in WP(C) No. 4528/2015 (*Mool Chand v. Union of India*) and similar petitions have been dismissed on the ground of laches.

4. In that view of the matter, learned counsel for the Petitioners seeks liberty to withdraw this petition with liberty to file a fresh petition giving a proper explanation for inordinate delay in the Petitioners approaching the Court for relief.

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 The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

SANJEEV NARULA, J.

JANUARY 31, 2019/ mw