



2024:DHC:2144



\$~57

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

% Judgment delivered on: 18.03.2024

+ W.P.(C) 4038/2024

BHAWNA GOEL

..... Petitioner

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. V.P. Rana, Ms. Bhawana and Ms. Himani Birhman, Advocates.

For the Respondents : Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Advocate for Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Standing Counsel and Mr. M.S. Akhtar, Advocate for R-2/ADM.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA****J U D G M E N T****TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J. (ORAL)****[The proceeding has been conducted through Hybrid mode]**

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

"It is, therefore, prayed that in view of the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ of Mandamus thereby directing the Respondent no.2 to extend the validity period of land status report for another 30 days and/or

Alternatively it is prayed that Respondent No.3 may kindly be directed to accept the sale deed for registration on the basis of Land Status report dated 19.02.2024 and/or;



Pass any other of further order which this Hon'ble Court may deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in favour of the appellant and against respondents."

2. Mr. V.P. Rana, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the respondent No.2 - ADM had already issued a Land Status Report ('LSR') on 19.02.2024, which is valid for a period of 30 days in accordance with the Section 5 of the Delhi Lands (Restrictions on Transfer) Act, 1972.
3. Mr. Rana further submits that the vendor – Mr. Gopal Goel was the one who had applied for the LSR and the same was issued in his name. The present petitioner is the intending purchaser, who had already purchased the requisite stamp papers. He submits that for some urgent reasons, the Mr. Gopal Goel – the vendor had to leave for abroad and has not come back as yet, in the meanwhile, the said LSR would expire today.
4. The petitioner had also furnished a request to extend the validity period of the LSR for a further period of 25 days and submitted such application on 13.03.2024. However, no response has been received on that said representation/ request till date.
5. Mr. Rana submits that all that the petitioner seeks is the renewal of the LSR, which has already been granted for the reason which is stated in the said representation.
6. Issue Notice.
7. Notice is accepted by Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.2 – ADM.
8. Since the LSR has already been issued once and the request for



2024:DHC:2144



renewal was already submitted on 13.03.2024 before the said LSR expired, it appears apposite to direct the respondent no.2 to consider the request for extension of the validity of the LSR for a suitable period.

9. In that view of the matter, the present petition along with pending applications is disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.2 – ADM to dispose of the application/ representation dated 13.03.2024 within one week from today.

10. The petitioner may also be informed of the same.

11. Order *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J.

MARCH 18, 2024/nd