



\$~50

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

+ W.P.(C) 396/2024, CM APPL. 1808/2024, CM APPL. 1809/2024 &
CM APPL. 10213/2024

SUNIL KUMAR DAGAR Petitioner
Through: Mr. Jatin Teotia, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, SPC for R-1.
Mr. Prashant Manchanda, ASC for
GNCTD with Mr. Angad Singh, Ms.
Nancy Shah & Ms. Medha Haridas,
Advs. for R-2 & 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

20.02.2024

%

(The proceeding has been conducted through Hybrid Mode)

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950 seeking inter-alia following reliefs:

“xxx xxx xxx

a) Direct the Respondents to mutate the land bearing old (pre-consolidation) khasra no. 230 (8-18) and 231 (3-13) with new (post consolidation) khasra no. 13//19(4-9), 20 (4-16), 21(4-16) & 22 (1-9) situated in village Dhansa, Najafgarh, New Delhi in favour of the Petitioner;

b) During the process of mutation stay the proceedings in case titled as Umed Singh & Ors. Versus Sunil Kumar Dagar & Ors. pending before the Ld. Additional District Magistrate, South West, Kapashera, New Delhi

c) Pass such other further order(s), direction(s) as may be deemed fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the present case.”



2. After having heard learned counsel and perusing the documents, it is apparent that the issue raised in the present petition by the petitioner is already a subject matter pending before the Revenue Authority.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the fact that the hearing notice dated 05.12.2023 was already served upon the petitioner apart from the fact that the order dated 22.02.2018 dismissing the objection of the petitioner regarding mutation in respect of Khasra Nos.230 and 231 qua the private opposing parties is mentioned in the present petition and is annexed at page 17 of the present petition.
4. In that view of the matter, it is apparent that not only is dispute on the issue pending before the Revenue Authority, but also is an issue on disputed questions of fact, which in any case cannot be entertained by this Court.
5. The present petition is not maintainable in view of the above observations. Therefore, it is dismissed as such, leaving the petitioner to avail of any other remedy available to him in law.
6. The petition is dismissed, along with the pending applications.

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

FEBRUARY 20, 2024/kr