

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

% **Date of order : 18<sup>th</sup> November 2022**

+ **W.P.(C) 13301/2022**

**SHRI KRISHAN KUMAR** ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. N. S. Dalal, Mr. Devesh Kumar  
Pratap, Mr. Alok Kumar and Ms.  
Rachana Dalal, Advocates

versus

**LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT AND ANR.**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Biraja Mahapatra and Mr. Rajat  
Sharma, Advocates for R-1

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA DHARI SINGH**

**ORDER**

**CHANDRA DHARI SINGH, J (Oral)**

1. The instant writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed seeking, *inter alia*, the following reliefs:

*(i) Issue a Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction thereby quashing the Order dated 09.03.2020 passed by the Respondent No.2, vide which the Application of the Petitioner for allotment of alternative plot was rejected by the Respondent No.2;*

*(ii) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction thereby directing the Respondents to make recommendation for allotment of alternative plot;*

2. The Petitioner was the owner of certain land situated in various Khasra Numbers including Khasra Nos.6113 (1-8), 18 (4-14), 23 (4-16), 8/4/1 (1-8), 7 (4-16), 8 (4-16) and 10117 (3-4), total land measuring 25 bighas 2 biswas situated in the revenue estate of Village Mubarakpur Dabas, Delhi. The Petitioner was having 1/6<sup>th</sup> share in the aforesaid land. The notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was issued on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2003 for acquisition of the land for the purpose of Rohini Residential Scheme under Planned Development of Delhi.

3. On the basis of the aforesaid notification, proceedings for acquisition of the land were started and an Award bearing No.16 of 2005-06 was announced on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2005. Possession of the land was taken on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2006 and compensation was paid to the Petitioner of his share on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2006. After receiving compensation and complying with all the formalities, the Petitioner moved an Application for allotment of alternative plot with the authorities on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2006. The application of the Petitioner was given the Number as F.33(87)/24/06/L&B.

4. The Petitioner received a letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> March 2017 from the office of the Respondent No.2, asking to appear on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017 and in pursuance thereto, the Petitioner appeared before the Authorities on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2017. The Petitioner received a letter dated 12<sup>th</sup> June 2017, wherein it was mentioned that a personal hearing will be given by the Recommendation Committee for allotment of alternative plot and the Petitioner in compliance of the letter appeared for personal hearing.

5. The Petitioner received a letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018 from the office of Superintendent, Land & Building Department vide which the

Petitioner was asked to furnish documents i.e. Affidavit in the prescribed form for not owning immovable property in urban area of Delhi including membership details of Cooperative Group Housing Society and the LAC Report. The Petitioner received an order dated 9<sup>th</sup> March 2020 vide which he was informed that his application was rejected as he is having ancestral property in Village Mubarakpur Dabas and hence, he is not eligible/entitled for allotment of alternative plot.

6. Aggrieved with the rejection of his application, the Petitioner has filed the instant writ petition.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner has contended that as per the Policy of the Respondents, the person concerned should not own the house outside Village Abadi and hence, the house within Village Abadi is permissible and there is no prohibition and bar for allotment of alternative plot. It is submitted that the ancestral house of the Petitioner is within the village Abadi and therefore, the Petitioner is entitled to the benefit of the 1961 scheme.

8. It is further submitted that two things i.e. owning a house and carrying on agricultural operations cannot be bifurcated. They have to stand together meaning thereby, in the absence of the house, there cannot be any agricultural operations. Thus, for agricultural operation, house is must and prohibition as mentioned above is that of not owning the house outside abadi.

9. It is also submitted that if the stand of the Respondent is to be adopted then the policy of allotment becomes meaningless and it renders the policy otiose for allotment of alternative plot. It is also submitted that the case of

the Petitioner is rejected on the basis of the decision of a Coordinate bench of this Court in ***Krishan Kumar Aggarwal vs. Land & Building Department, W.P. (C) 758/2015*** decided on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016, which is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

10. *Per Contra*, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondents submitted that if the scheme has been introduced by the Government to enable the citizens to have a roof over their head does not mean that the scheme is meant for the enrichment of people. It is also submitted that in view of the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court, it is now settled that if a person is having any plot he is not entitled for alternative plot. Therefore, there is no illegality in the impugned order passed by the competent authority and the writ petition is liable to be dismissed being devoid of any merit.

11. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

12. This Court has also perused the rejection order dated 9<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and deems it appropriate to reproduce the relevant portion.

*“The Land & Building Department, GNCT Delhi forwarded the application of Sh. Krishan Kumar S/o Sh Ram Saroop R/o 322, VPO Mubarakpur Dabas, Delhi-81, diarized at S.No. 2024 dated 23.11.2006 regarding allotment of alternative plot in lieu of his/her land situated at village Mubarakpur Dabas acquired by the Government for undertaking various development/infrastructural projects, to the District Task Force, District North-West, Kanjhawala, Delhi. File has been assigned Seniority No. 5921 by Land & Building Department. As per record deficiency memo was issued to the applicant vide letters dated 19.8.2016/22.1.18/31.10.18 and the applicant was also given an opportunity of personal hearing on 21.6.2017 which was attended by himself.*

*The Notification U/s 4 of the Land Acquisition Act was issued on 21.3.2003. The award was announced on 14.9.2005. The Possession of the acquired land has been taken by the Government on 4.4.2006. The payment released to applicant on 23.6.2006. As per record the total land in the name of applicant and others is 25 bigha 02 biswa. The land acquired by the government is 25 bigha 02 biswa.*

*The District Task Force Recommendation Committee of District North West, Kanjhawala, Delhi, in meeting held on 30.9.2019 has not recommended the allotment of alternative plot in your case. After careful examination of the documents placed on record the undersigned being the Competent Authority hereby rejects the application on following ground (s):-*

*1. Applicant has ancestral property I Owns residential property in Village Mubarakpur Dabas and in view of the order dated 5.8.16 of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in WP (C) 758/2015 titled Krishan Kr Aggarwal Vs Land & Building Department in which it has been stated that the persons who were owning alternate accommodations or who had residential covers over their head were not entitled to alternate plots, the applicant is not eligible/entitled for allotment of alternate plot."*

13. The issues to be adjudicated by this Court are:

**Issue 1- If the person is having a plot/constructed house in the area of Abadi, would he be entitled for alternative plot under scheme of 1961?**

**Issue 2- Whether the present writ petition is liable to be dismissed on the grounds of delays and laches?**

14. In the instant matter, the relevant conditions, which became the ground for rejection of Petitioner's application, were that he held land in abadi area and was not landless.

15. The condition of holding a plot/residential accommodation being a bar for consideration of application of allotment of alternative plot is a bar which finds mention in the first as well as the subsequently modified version of the Scheme of 1961. The availability of an existing plot in the name of the owner or any of his dependent, including his/her spouse or even unmarried children, creates a bar on the eligibility of the person to have an alternative plot allotted in his/her favour.

16. In ***Surinder Singh Mann vs. Government of NCT of Delhi, W.P.(C) 12306/2015*** decided on 25th August 2017 the Coordinate Bench of this Court observed as under:-

*"7. At this stage, it would also be useful to extract the eligibility criteria of the Government which had been approved by the Government of NCT of Delhi in the year 1961 dealing with allotment of alternate plots. The object of the scheme reads as under:-*

*"The scheme of providing developed residential plots to farmers whose lands are acquired for planned development of Delhi is a rehabilitation measure."*

*8. The object thus clearly being to provide developed residential plots to farmers whose land had been acquired for the planned development of Delhi; this being a rehabilitative measure.*

XXX

*12 .... The Policy of the Government as is evident from the scheme was to provide residential plots to farmers whose land had been acquired; it was a rehabilitative measure; meaning thereby that it was to rehabilitate those farmers whose land had been acquired as they had become homeless or landless.”*

17. However, the Scheme for alternative plot does not confer a direct and absolute right to any person whose land is acquired. The Scheme provides for conditions under paragraph 10, which were updated and modified with time and as per requirements. These conditions acted as eligibility criteria for the land owners whose lands were acquired and who became entitled to be considered for allotment of alternate plot, subject to the conditions laid.

18. These conditions which stood under paragraph 10 of the first Scheme are reproduced hereunder:-

*“10. The following conditions shall govern the allotment of land whether by auction or otherwise to individuals (including those whose land has been acquired):*

*a) No plot should be allotted to any person, who or whose wife/husband or any of his/her dependent relations including unmarried children owns a house or residential plot of land in Delhi, New Delhi or Delhi Cantonment. The question of making an exception in the case of persons living in a congested locality or whose family has out-grown should be considered after some experience has been gained of the working of the scheme.*

*b) The allottee of a plot should be required to construct the house in accordance with the sanctioned plans within two years of the date of allotment, failing which the land would be liable to be resumed.*

*c) The allottee of a plot shall not sell or transfer rights in the plot or part thereof for a period of 10 years from the date of allotment except with the previous approval of the Chief Commissioner which will be given only in Exceptional circumstances. Thereafter the permission to sell will be given by chief commissioner. In both the cases, 50% of the unearned increase in the value of the plot will be paid to the Government before the transfer is permitted.....”*

19. With subsequent amendments and modifications in the successive years, the Scheme ultimately provided for the following eligibility criteria for allotment of alternate plot:-

*“1. The persons who are RECORDED OWNER prior to issue of notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act.*

*2. The persons whose lands have been acquired must have received the compensation as rightful owners from the LAC/Court and the Govt. has taken the possession of acquired land.*

*3. The applicants should not own a house/residential plot/flat out of village Abadi in his/her dependent relation's name including unmarried children, nor he should be a member of any Co-operative Housing Society.*

*4. For awards announced prior to 3.4.86, the land acquired is not less than 150 square yards and for awards announced post 3.4.86, the land must not be less than one bigha.”*

20. An examination of the objective of the Scheme read with the observations made in the above-mentioned judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court, definitively and unambiguously indicate that the Scheme of 1961 is targeted to those individuals, villagers,

farmers etc. who may be rendered homeless or landless upon their land being acquired by the Government, or any Authority under it, for the purposes of development. However, it should also be borne in mind that in garb of such welfare schemes, those who have alternative and effective means of sustaining a life do not take unfair advantage of the schemes and welfare provisions of the Government and its Authorities. Keeping in mind the objective of the Scheme, it is found that enforcing an eligibility criterion for consideration of application of allotment of alternate land is not unreasonable or unfair and is in fact required for ensuring that the active and effective measures reach those who are in need.

21. In the instant matter, the perusal of the contents of the impugned order reveals that the Petitioner owns an ancestral property in village Abadi. As discussed above, the position is clear for those individuals whose land has been acquired and who seek alternative accommodation or plot; they are to fulfill the necessary conditions of the Scheme of 1961, in consonance with the objective the Scheme seeks to achieve.

22. The Division Bench of this Court in ***Government of NCT of Delhi vs. Veerwati*, 2012 SCC OnLine Del 1444**, and its connected LPAs, held that there are four requisite conditions for consideration while filing and adjudicating the application for allotment of alternative plot. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced hereunder: -

*“3. In the year 1961 the Government formulated the scheme for allotment of alternate plots to those land owners whose land is acquired for planned development of Delhi and the land so acquired is placed at the disposal of the DDA. The allotment of*

*alternate plot under this policy was subject to his satisfying, beside others, following conditions: —*

- a) The application must have been filed within a period of one year from the date of receipt of the compensation.*
- b) He should be recorded owner of the acquired land prior to the date of issuance of the Notification under Section 4 of the Act.*
- c) He must have received the compensation for the said land as a rightful owner and the possession of the acquired land has been taken by the Government.*
- d) Neither he nor his spouse nor any of his dependent children own any residential property in Delhi.”*

23. Therefore, this Court does not find force in the argument of the Petitioner that as per the modification in the year 1993 in Scheme of 1961, if an applicant owns a land in village abadi, it will not create a bar for recommending him for allotment of alternative plot. It is pertinent to refer to ***Ranjeet Singh vs. Govt (NCT of Delhi)*, 2017 SCC OnLine Del 10794**, wherein it was observed as under: -

*“24. As far as the first contention is concerned, that the executive's interpretation that the landowner should not be left with any lands at all is contrary to the letter of the scheme, this Court is unpersuaded by the argument. The object of the scheme clearly stipulates that it is to provide alternative plots to "farmers whose lands are acquired". To take the logic of the appellants, conceivably, one individual may own land in four different parts of Delhi, in three different villages. To say that if portions of land in two villages, affecting two pieces of such landholding are acquired, he would still answer the description of a farmer whose lands are acquired would be stretching the meaning and intent of the scheme. The broad understanding of the authorities and officials of the Govt. of NCT of Delhi, who considered Jai Singh Kanwar (supra) and granted or allowed*

*applications only where no lands were left at all, with the land owners, is, from this perspective, wholly reasonable. The object, as we understand, of the scheme is not to provide all landowners whose lands are acquired but only to extend benefit to those who lost all their landholdings due to acquisition.*

xxxxxxx

*55. The Court notices that the appellants' argument that ownership of land or residential property in the village or extended abadi is not to be construed as a bar is, no doubt, justified. Yet, the fact that a dispossessed land owner has ownership or possession of a residence in the village, ipso facto, cannot entitle him or her to make an enforceable claim for allotment of alternative plot. Particularly when the left over lands with appellants are urbanized ones."*

24. Therefore, Petitioner cannot claim that he has a right to allotment of alternative land merely because he owns a land in abadi area.

***Answer to Issue 2-***

25. It is a well established rule of law that delay defeats equity and if the Petitioner has approached the Court of law after a long period of time after the cause of action has arisen, then the relief prayed by him/her may be denied on the ground of delay and laches.

26. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***State of Karnataka & Ors. vs. S.M. Kotrayya & Ors., (1996) 6 SCC 267***, has held as under :-

*"9. Thus considered, we hold that it is not necessary that the respondents should give an explanation for the delay which occasioned for the period mentioned in subsections (1) or (2) of Section 21, but they should give explanation for the delay which occasioned after the expiry of the aforesaid respective*

*period applicable to the appropriate case and the Tribunal should be required to satisfy itself whether the explanation offered was proper explanation. In this case, the explanation offered was that they came to know of the relief granted by the Tribunal in August 1989 and that they filed the petition immediately thereafter. That is not a proper explanation at all. What was required of them to explain under sub-sections (1) and (2) was as to why they could not avail of the remedy of redressal of their grievance before the expiry of the period prescribed under sub-section (1) or (2). That was not the explanation given. Therefore, the Tribunal is wholly unjustified in condoning the delay.”*

27. In ***Shiv Dass vs. Union of India & Ors., (2007) 9 SCC 274***, the Hon’ble Supreme Court held as under:

*“8....The High Court does not ordinarily permit a belated resort to the extraordinary remedy because it is likely to cause confusion and public inconvenience and bring in its train new injustices, and if writ jurisdiction is exercised after unreasonable delay, it may have the effect of inflicting not only hardship and inconvenience but also injustice on third parties. It was pointed out that when writ jurisdiction is invoked, unexplained delay coupled with the creation of third party rights in the meantime is an important factor which also weighs with the High Court in deciding whether or not to exercise such jurisdiction.”*

28. Admittedly, the Petitioner was informed about the rejection of his application for allotment of alternative land on 9th March 2020, but the instant writ petition has been filed only on 10th November 2022. There has been a delay of 2 years and 8 months but the Petitioner has failed to provide any explanation for the same. Merely citing that covid-19 outbreak led to the delay in the filing of the writ petition would not help the case of Petitioner as

no justifiable cause has been assigned to explain the entire delay in the filing of the present petition.

29. Law favours only those who are alive as to their rights and not those who sleep over their rights. This is a fit case wherein the maxim *vigilantibus non dormientibus jura subveniunt* is fully attracted. The above maxim entails that law will come to the aid of only those who are vigilant about their rights and do not sleep over their rights. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner is infected with delays and laches and is liable to be dismissed on this ground alone.

30. In view of the foregoing discussion on merits, this Court does not find any illegality, impropriety or error apparent on the face of record in the impugned order dated 9th March 2020 passed by the concerned Authority. There is no reason to interfere with the said impugned order passed on the application of the Petitioner.

31. Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed on both the grounds i.e., on the basis of delays and laches as well as on merits.

32. Pending applications, if any, also stand dismissed.

33. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

**(CHANDRA DHARI SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**NOVEMBER 18, 2022**  
**gs/mg**