

\$~24

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11864/2015**

NARENDRA KUMAR MOHATTA Petitioner
Through Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha & Mr. Anand
Kumar Dubey, Advocates

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Mr. Sunil
Kumar Jha & Mr. M.S.Akhtar,
Advocates for Respondents no.1 & 2
Mr. Dhanesh Relan, Standing counsel
with Ms. Mrinalini Sharma,
Advocates for Respondent/DDA

CORAM:
JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR
JUSTICE I.S.MEHTA

ORDER
20.03.2019

%

1. The prayers in the petition read as under:-

“A. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, or order declaring the Land Acquisition Proceedings initiated in respect of land of petitioner forming part of the notification dated 27.06.1996 (Annexure P-2) and Public Notice Dated 21.11.2012 (Annexure P-4) situated in the Revenue Estate of Village Malikpuri Kohi @ Rangpuri, New Delhi as deemed to have lapsed on 26.12.2013 in view of the provisions of Section 24(2) of the "The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013; and consequently

B. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, or order direction declaring all acquisition

under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to have lapsed with respect to 1 bigha of land comprising of 20/1216th share in agricultural land measuring 60 bighas and 16 biswas in Khasra Nos.1082(4- 16), 1085(4-16), 1086(4-16), 1087(4-16), 1088/2(4-7), 1092/1(4-9), 1092/2(0-7), 1434/1(4-5), 1450(5-13), 1451(7-9), 1452(4-16), 1808(5-19), 1809(4-7), situated in village Malikpur Kohl alias Rangpuri, New Delhi pursuant to the Section 24(2) of the "The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013; and

C. further pass any order as deemed appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. The Petitioner does not dispute that the earlier notification under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was invalidated and therefore the Award passed pursuant thereto has no validity in the eye of law. Consequently, with there being no Award, the question of granting the reliefs prayed for under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act does not arise.
3. The petition is misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.

S. MURALIDHAR, J.

I.S. MEHTA, J.

MARCH 20, 2019

mw