



\$~16

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

+ **CM APPL. 10235/2025 in CONT.CAS(C) 609/2022**

**RAMESH LAKHWANI (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LEGAL
REPRESENTATIVES**Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajat Aneja and Mr. Saubhagya
Chauriha, Advs.

versus

SHRI MANISH KUMAR GUPTARespondent

Through: Mr. Kailash Vasdev, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Tushar Sannu, Adv. for DDA
along with Mr. Kuldeep Kumar,
Director-RL, DDA

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL**

ORDER
15.05.2025

%

CM APPL. 5520/2025

1. For the reasons stated in the application, delay of 16 days in filing compliance affidavit stands condoned and compliance affidavit is taken on record
2. Application stands disposed of.

CM APPL. 10235/2025 in CONT.CAS(C) 609/2022

1. Though the above captioned contempt petition already stands disposed of by judgment dated 27th November 2024, instant application has been filed by petitioner.



2. The issue under consideration relates to the compliance report filed by the Delhi Development Authority ('DDA'), to purge itself of the contempt of this Court.

3. *Mr. Kailash Vasdev*, Senior Counsel appearing for DDA points out that, by judgment dated 27th November 2024 passed in this contempt petition, the Court found officials of respondents/DDA guilty of committing contempt of the directions of this Court.

4. He seeks to argue essentially that there is no wilful or deliberate disobedience of the directions issued by this Court. The position taken by the respondents is essentially that they are constrained due to a decision of Coordinate Bench of this Court.

5. To elucidate, the following facts are necessary to be appreciated, from respondent's point of view.

6. *Mr. Vasdev* states that while they are faced with purging this contempt, they also face an issue arising out of the judgement by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, in ***Govind Sharan Sharma v. Delhi Development Authority & Another*** in **W.P.(C) 2802/2020**, pertaining to allotment of plots in 166 cases allegedly made on basis of forged recommendation letters issued by Land and Building Department. This also included the recommendation letter issued to *Sh. Ranjit Singh* based on which *Plot Number J-221 Malviya Nagar Extension* was allotted. Relevant aspects of the said judgment are extracted as under:

"[.....] The DDA shall continue its enquiries and shall take action in accordance with law in an expeditious manner. Efforts shall be made to retrieve the properties which were allotted on forged letter basis with alacrity and with diligence. The efforts of the DDA shall, accordingly, continue. In so far as the investigation is concerned, the entire investigation into the two FIRs



bearing nos. 85/2023 and 77/2024, PS Kotla Mubrakpur be handed over to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) by the EOW-Delhi Police. **The CBI shall conduct a thorough investigation in this matter in respect of all the allotments made on forged documents and take action in accordance with law. [....]**

(emphasis added)

7. It is therefore stated that investigation by the Central Bureau of Investigation ('CBI') is still ongoing. Respondent/DDA cannot prove authenticity of the recommendation letters, available in DDA records, which could be possibly forged.

8. Accordingly, petitioner was asked to submit documents and on basis of the said documents, a speaking order had been passed on 17th January 2025, concluding as under:

“12. Whereas, the matter of allotment of alternative plots on the basis of forged recommendation is already under investigation at CBI as per the direction of Hon'ble Court in W.P .(C) 2802/2020 titled “Govind Saran Sharma vs. Delhi Development Authority & Ors.” The CBI has seized all the original property files relating to forged recommendation letter, vide seizure memo dated 27.08.2024, for the purpose of investigation, including the property no. J-221, Saket i.e. the property pertaining to petitioner.

13. Considering all the facts that the recommendation letter available in DOA records stated by L&BD seems to be forged, different recommendation letter provided by the applicant, there is difference in the name of recommendee and issuing authority is different in office copy as well as in petitioner's copy and also the original property file seized by CBI for investigating matter, it could be concluded that authenticity of recommendation of L&BD is highly doubtful/apocryphal.

14. In view of the above facts mentioned above, even after disregarding the letter dated 17.02.1981, and keeping in view the documents produced by the petitioner during the



scrutiny of necessary documents for conversion from leasehold to freehold, following due process, it has been decided by the Competent Authority to reject the conversion application till the investigation by CBI is concluded. Further, the petitioner may be requested to submit his/her bank details so that conversion charges paid may be refunded.”

9. He therefore states that respondents are not guilty of contempt of Court’s orders and have not wilfully/deliberately disobeyed orders of this Court.

10. To assess this plea, relevant sequence of events are narrated as under:

- a. The issue pertains to a plot of land measuring 200 square yards, allotted by the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi (GNCTD) through Land and Building Department in favour of *Sh. Ranjit Singh* in February 1979. In January and February 1980, *Sh. Ranjit Singh* executed a General Power of Attorney (‘GPA’) in favour of his elder brother *Shri. Laxman Lakhwani* who was authorized to do acts mentioned under the GPA. *Sh. Ranjit Singh* also executed an Agreement to Sell in favour of the petitioner that the lease hold rights be transferred for a consideration. *Shri. Laxman Lakhwani* as the GPA applied to the DDA for grant of sanction to carry out construction over the plot. The sanction was granted by the DDA in May 1980, and the utility connections were also provided.
- b. In 2012, petitioner through *Shri. Laxman Lakhwani* as GPA applied for conversion and paid the conversion charges of **Rs.2,31,488/-**. In 2012, a letter was received from the ***Lease Administration Branch (Residential)*** of DDA, where petitioner was advised to seek clearance from the Land and Building Department, stating that the file could not be processed since there was a list of cases where documents were reported to be



forged, and had been kept in abeyance.

- c. After many attempts to represent before the authorities, finally a Writ Petition being **W.P.(C) 3359/2017** was filed by petitioner before this Court. The same was finally disposed of by the judgment dated **18th March 2021** by the Coordinate Bench of this Court. The objection raised by DDA hovered around the same issue of allegations of forgery and pending investigation. This was clearly articulated by the Court in *paragraphs 5 to 8* of the said decision, which are extracted as under:

“5. Clearly, the DDA only states that a request has been made to not make any allotment or to execute lease deed or to revoke the allotment. The rationale for the said request was that there was forgery apropos 128 cases and the files of 38 cases were not traceable. The said request would ex facie not be applicable to the petitioner because in his case, the perpetual lease deed had already been executed way back on 20.10.1980, whereas the request letter from the Government was sent about 4 months later i.e. on 17.02.1981. A right which already stood accrued in favour of Mr. Ranjit Singh, cannot be revoked or disturbed simply because the Government suspects that the allotment to Mr. Ranjit Singh could have been on the basis of a forged document, etc. The suspicion would have to be made good on the basis of some documentation.

6. The file itself is not available with the Government, even after a lapse of 40 years. That would not deprive the original allottee/Mr. Ranjit Singh and/or his successor in interest from enjoying the property in its fullness. Neither the Government nor the DDA has taken any action for the past 40 years. Additionally, the Government has not pursued the investigation, nor has any further request been made to the DDA with respect to the said allotment to Mr. Ranjit Singh. It did not even bother to enquire from the DDA as to whether the property had already been handed over to Mr. Ranjit Singh and/or whether the perpetual lease deed has been executed in his favour.



7. A purported communication which seeks to disturb, take away or abridge rights accrued in favour of an allottee, merely on the basis of suspicion, cannot be permitted to be given effect to. Something more has to be made available so as to show that the allottee had committed a fraud or misled either the Government or the DDA. There is nothing on record to show what steps the Government took to trace the 38 missing files, or even with respect to the so called police investigation which commenced in the year 1981. In the circumstances, the Government's communication, would be of no consequence apropos the allotment in favour of Mr. Ranjit Singh. There is no averment or suspicion that Mr. Ranjit Singh had misled the government or had committed a fraud. An embargo on his rights is sought only because the government has misplaced his and 37 similar allotment files. The Land and Building Department has not specified what action it took to trace-out the files; whether any Show Cause Notice was issued or Departmental action was initiated against its own officials who may have been responsible for the safe keeping of the files or whether any endeavour was made to recreate the files.

8. The learned counsel for the DDA/R-1 submits that despite issuance of a letter to the petitioner in 2012 to seek clearance from the Land and Building Department, and the aforesaid letter dated 14.08.2014 to the GNCTD apropos the present status of the investigation carried out in the aforesaid cases and to verify the genuineness of the recommendees, the Government has kept silent. Apparently, the Government has nothing to say in the matter. Therefore, its aforesaid communication dated 17.02.1981 to the DDA will be presumed to be without basis and is to be disregarded."

(emphasis added)

Accordingly, the Court concluded and directed as under:

"9. In view of the above, the DDA is directed to disregard the said communication and examine the petitioner's case



for conversion of the lease hold land into free-hold upon payment of requisite charges.

10. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as demanded, an amount of Rs.2,31,488/-, has already been paid to the DDA on 01.03.2012. Let the DDA intimate the petitioner if any further information or documents are required, in 2 weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. The said information or documentation shall be supplied to the DDA in 2 weeks thereafter. The DDA shall consider the petitioner's case and complete the process by 30.06.2021."

(emphasis added)

- d. Since compliance was not made of the said order, this contempt petition was filed in 2022.
- e. In the meantime, judgment dated **18th March 2021** was challenged by the DDA before the Division Bench in **LPA No. 498/2022**. Yet again, the issue relating to allegedly forged recommendations and DDA's decision of not taking any action, was considered in detail by the Division Bench of this Court. Relevant paragraphs are extracted as under:

"9. Since no response was being provided regarding the file which is said to have included the plot in question in the list of cases and also the direction to keep the allotment of the plot in abeyance and also since no action was being taken by the Appellant/DDA to process the application of the Respondent No.1 for conversion of the property from leasehold to freehold, the Respondent No.1 approached this Court by filing the writ petition bearing W.P.(C) 3359/2017 with the following prayers:

"It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a Writ in the nature of MANDAMUS and/or any other appropriate Writ/Order/Direction of like nature thereby directing and commanding the Respondents, and particularly the Respondent No. 1 (Delhi Development



Authority), to early out the conversion of the Property bearing No. J-221, Malviya Nagar Extension, Saket, New Delhi-110017 from leasehold into freehold in accordance with its Policy Guidelines and on the basis of the Application already submitted alongwith all the requisite documents, in the light of the detailed facts and circumstances narrated hereinabove. Any other order (s) which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case may be passed in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondent.”

9. The Appellant/DDA has filed a counter affidavit stating that Joint Secretary (L&B), Delhi Administration, forwarded a list of 128 cases vide letter dated F.15(210)80-L&B/7352 dated 17.02.1981 which were reported to on the basis of forged recommendations and the Appellant/DDA was requested not to make any allotment or to execute lease deed and also to revoke the allotment, if any, made. It is stated that another list of 38 cases was also enclosed by GNCTD intimating that the case files of those cases are not traceable with them and desired that no action need to be taken in the 38 cases and they must be kept in abeyance. It is stated the present case is one of the 38 cases where L&B, Department desired the DDA not to take any action and to keep it in abeyance.

10. The counter affidavit also discloses that the decision taken by the Government was communicated to Ranjit Singh S/o Kali Ram vide letter dated 22.06.1981 and a copy of the same was also endorsed to Joint Secy., L&B Department in response to its letter dated 17.02.1981.

11. The counter affidavit also discloses that a letter dated 06.06.2012 was sent to Respondent No.1 with a request to seek clearance from the Land and Building Department, Delhi Administration i.e., Respondent No.2 herein, before the case of Respondent No.1 for the desired conversion into freehold could be processed owing to the reason that the L&B department had directed Appellant/DDA not to take any action and keep the cases in abeyance.



.....
16. Ms. Manika Tripathy, learned Standing Counsel for the DDA, vehemently contends that the after execution of the Perpetual Lease Deed dated 27.10.1980, the Joint Secretary (L&B), Delhi Administration, forwarded a list of 128 cases vide letter F.15(210)80-L&B/7352 dated 17.02.1981 which were reported to on the basis of forged recommendations and the Appellant/DDA was directed not to make any allotment or to execute lease deed and also to revoke the allotment, if any, made. She further submits that another list of 38 cases was also enclosed by L&B Department GNCTD and directed that no action need to be taken in the said 38 cases and they must be kept in abeyance. She submits that the Respondent No.1's case was one of the 38 cases where L&B Department had directed the DDA not to take any action and to keep the cases in abeyance. She submits that Ranjit Singh S/o Kali Ram had also been informed about the decision taken by the Government vide letter dated 22.06.1981. Ms. Tripathi submits that allotment had been made on the basis of forged recommendations, and therefore, the Appellant/DDA was well within its rights not to proceed ahead with the application for conversion of the property in question from leasehold to freehold.

17. The said letter F.15(210)80-L&B/7352 dated 17.02.1981 which is the basis of the justification of the DDA for not accepting the application of the Respondent No.1 for conversion of the property in question from leasehold to freehold is not on record. It has been categorically stated that the concerned files are not traceable. After the year 1981, the Appellant/DDA has not taken any steps to cancel the Perpetual Lease Deed and on the contrary, the Appellant/DDA has granted permission to carry out construction over the property in question. Electricity and water connections have been provided to the property. No action has been taken by the State Government after 1981. The Respondent No.1 has been made to run from pillar to post for his application



for conversion of the property in question from leasehold to freehold. Information had also been sought under Right to Information Act, 2005 in respect of the concerned file which is said to have included the plot in question in the list of cases by the Land and Building Department, Government of NCT of Delhi, however, no information has been provided on the ground that the file is not traceable. Appeals were also filed before the Appellate Authority against the non-disclosure of the information under Right to Information Act, 2005 but to no avail.

18. In the absence of any action on the part of the Appellant/DDA and the other authorities, this Court does not find any reason to interfere with the findings of the learned Single Judge. The learned Single Judge was justified in holding that the letter dated 17.02.1981 sent to the DDA which is not on record has to be ignored and that cannot be the basis for denial of right to Respondent No.1 to demand conversion of the property in question from leasehold to freehold. There is nothing on record to show that Ranjit Singh/allottee has committed any kind of fraud in getting the plot in question. As rightly pointed by the learned Single Judge that the Land and Building Department has not specified as to what action it has taken to trace-out the files; whether any Show Cause Notice was issued or any Departmental action has been initiated against its own officials who may have been responsible for the safe keeping of the files or whether any endeavour was made to recreate the files. There is also nothing on record to show that the Appellant/DDA has taken any Departmental action on its officials who were executed Perpetual Lease Deed nor has Land and Building Department, GNCTD brought on record anything to show as to what action has been taken against its officials who were responsible for making the forged recommendations.”

(emphasis added)

On this basis, the Court concluded as under:

“19. In view of the above, the letter dated 17.02.1981



which is not on record cannot become the basis of denial of right to Respondent No.1 to demand conversion of the property in question from leasehold to freehold.

20. In view of the harassment that has been caused to Respondent No.1, this Court is inclined to impose costs of Rs.10,000/- on the DDA.”

(emphasis added)

f. The decision of the Division Bench was again challenged by the DDA before the Supreme Court in **SLP (C) No. 25643/2023** which was dismissed by order dated **18th August 2023**.

11. All these aspects are noted by this Court in the Contempt Petition in detailed judgment dated 27th November 2024 *inter alia* in the following paragraphs 9 to 15 . Relevant paragraphs are extracted as under:

“9. At the outset, the respondent/DDA cannot be allowed to take shelter behind the directions passed in W.P.(C) 2802/2020 titled „Govind Saran Sharma v. Delhi Development Authority & Ors.” vide order dated 18.03.2024. Indeed, this Court in the aforesaid case has given directions to the DDA to carry out a massive exercise inter alia with regard to the following:

“(a) retrieve the properties which came to be allotted based upon forged recommendation letters; (b) intimate the concerned Sub-Registrars so that no further third party rights can be created in respect of these properties; (c) withdraw the allotments and take possession of the properties which came to be allotted based upon forged recommendation letters.”

10. However, the aforesaid directions do not in any way eclipse or overtake the directions which have been passed in the main writ petition bearing No. 3359/2017, passed by this Court vide order dated 18.03.2021, that gives rise to the instant petition. It is pertinent to mention here that the learned Single Judge while passing the directions vide order dated 18.03.2021 was alive to the fact that there



were 38 files with regard to questionable allotment of land, including that of the original allottee Shri Ranjit Singh from whom the original petitioner acquired right and interest in the subject property, which were not traceable, and reference was made to DDA's letter dated 14.08.2014, which reads as under:-

“.... Please find enclosed herewith a copy of recommendation letter No. F.32(21)/5/78/L&B/Alt/3410 dated 5.2.1979 issued by Under Secretary(CN), Land & Building Department, Delhi Administration in favour of Shri Ranjit Singh s/o Shri Kali Ram. The Jt. Secretary(L&B), Delhi Adm. Vide letter No.15(210)/80-L&B/7352 dated 17.2.1981 has forwarded the list of 128 cases and further 38 cases stating that these are forged and requested not to make any allotment or to execute lease deed and also revoke the allotment. You are, therefore, requested to kindly intimate the present status of investigation carried out in these cases and verify the genuineness of the enclosed recommendation letter to enable us to take further action in the matter.”

11. It was, thus, found that the rationale behind the aforementioned request was that there was forgery apropos 128 cases and files of 38 cases were not traceable. However, it was specifically held that perpetual lease deed had already been executed against the petitioner way back on 20.10.1980 whereas the request letter from the Delhi Government was sent about four months later on 17.02.1981. It was specifically held that the legal right already stood accrued in favour of the original allottee Shri Ranjit Singh, which could not have been revoked or disturbed simply because the Government suspected that the allotment of land to the original allottee i.e., Shri Ranjit Singh could have been made on the basis of forged documents. It was in the teeth of the aforesaid observations that the direction was passed to the respondent/DDA to disregard the communication dated 17.02.1981 and examine the case of the petitioner for



conversion of leasehold land into freehold upon payment of requisite charges.

12. It is pertinent to mention here that except for the aforesaid directions which have been passed by this Court dated 18.03.2024 in W.P. (C) 2802/2020, the position remains unchanged that 38 files including the file of the original allottee in the present matter, remain untraceable.

13. During the course of arguments, it was pointed out that the Land and Building Department, GNCTD, has apprised the DDA vide letter dated 25.01.2024 that “it does not have records of the subject property and hence it cannot confirm the genuineness of the recommendation letter”. However, at the same time it is informed that the authenticity of the recommendation letter cannot be ascertained, but it is opined that the recommendation letter seems to be forged.

14. Mr. Sanjay Katyal, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent/DDA, urged that the DDA on its part conducted an examination so as to verify the original documents of the subject property on 03.04.2024 and 05.04.2024 and on comparing the recommendation letter submitted by Smt. Madhumita Lakhwani w/o late Shri Ramesh Lakhwani, with the recommendation letter available with the DDA, it has been observed that there are differences between the two, for which reference was invited to the deposition in the affidavit filed by the DDA dated 24.04.2024. The said plea cannot be countenanced in law since there is no legal determination whatsoever at this stage that the recommendation letter in respect of the subject property was forged.

15. In the same vein, the plea that the officials of the respondent/DDA are not guilty of contempt in view of the subsequent events unfolding with respect of 38 missing files, consequent to the directions in W.P.(C) 2802/2020 vide order dated 18.03.2024, cannot be sustained in law either. If the plea of the respondent/DDA is accepted, that would tantamount to accepting a challenge to the legality of the initial order dated 18.03.2021 passed in W.P.(C)



3359/2017. It goes without saying that the impugned order dated 18.03.2021 was unsuccessfully assailed in LPA No. 489/2020 and finally the respondent/DDA preferred SLP (Civil) No. 25643/2023, which also came to be dismissed by the Supreme Court vide order dated 18.08.2023.”

After consideration and assessment of DDA’s pleas, yet again, the Court concluded as under:

“22. At the cost of repetition, this Court, in contempt jurisdiction, cannot go into the legality of the aforesaid directions dated 18.03.2021. In fact, the Coordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.(C) 2802/2020, has also not gone into the legality of the impugned directions as such.

23. Unhesitatingly, the concerned officials of the respondent/DDA are clearly guilty of committing wilful and deliberate disobedience of directions of this Court. The concerned officials of the respondent/DDA have no legal justification to deny the petitioners the benefits of directions dated 18.03.2021 in the backdrop that the conversion charges with regard to the subject plot already stood paid by the original petitioner as on 01.03.2012.

24. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court finds that the officials of the respondent/DDA are guilty of committing contempt of the directions of this Court dated 18.03.2021. However, in order to enable the respondent/DDA to purge itself of the contempt, the officials of the respondent/DDA are granted four weeks” time to initiate appropriate process for conversion of leasehold rights of the petitioner into freehold rights, on payment of charges as on the date W.P.(C) 3359/2017 was filed i.e., 17.04.2017. The respondent/DDA shall bear the entire cost of purchase of stamp papers and registration charges for such conversion and registration of Conveyance Deed in favour of the petitioners.

25. The present contempt petition stands disposed of accordingly. 26. Let a compliance report with regard to aforesaid directions be filed within six weeks from today,



failing which the officials of the respondent/DDA shall be dealt with in accordance with law.”

(emphasis added)

12. Subsequent to these facts and circumstances, the same plea is again raised by *Mr. Kailash Vasdev*, Senior Counsel for DDA, assisted by *Mr. Tushar Sannu*, Advocate, that DDA be absolved of the contempt considering that they are faced with this peculiar situation of CBI investigation being pending regarding alleged forged documents.

13. *Mr. Kailash Vasdev*, Senior Counsel for DDA, therefore in this context contends that they are not in wilful default of orders passed by this Court on 18th March 2021. He, therefore, states that the compliance, in the manner, as had been directed by the Court, could not be done in this context.

14. *Mr. Rajat Aneja*, Advocate appearing on behalf of petitioner, besides drawing attention of this Court to above facts and circumstances, has additionally pointed out to a modification application moved by the DDA before the Writ Court which was dismissed by order dated **23rd January 2024**, in *C.M No. 2431/2024* in **W.P.(C) 3359/2017**. The Court yet again noted the sequence of events and same plea canvassed by the DDA and concluded as under:

“27. This is clearly not acceptable, as the DDA has tried to overreach this Court by suppressing the actual facts of the present matter.

28. Once the judgment dated 18th March, 2021 passed in the present proceedings has attained finality by dismissal of the appeals of the DDA by the Division Bench and the Supreme Court, there was no occasion for the DDA to file application being CM No. 2431/2024 for modification of the judgment dated 18th March, 2021. What is glaring is the conduct of the DDA in not mentioning the fact of the orders passed by the Division Bench and the Supreme



Court in dismissing its appeals challenging the judgment dated 18th March, 2021 passed in the present proceedings. All these facts ought to have been clearly mentioned in the application by the DDA.

29. Since the judgment dated 18th March, 2021 passed in the present proceedings, has already attained finality, the same cannot be modified at the instance of the DDA at this stage.

30. The said application filed by DDA is clearly misplaced. There is no occasion for the DDA to seek modification of the judgment passed in the present proceedings, since the said judgment has already attained finality upon dismissal of its appeal by the Supreme Court.

31. The contention on behalf of DDA that the orders passed by the Division Bench and the Supreme Court were not mentioned in its application being CM No. 2431/2024 on account of the fact that a detailed reply had already been filed by the DDA in the affidavit of the DDA in the Cont. Cas (C) No. 609/2022, is unacceptable and is rejected.

32. In view thereof, CM No. 2431/2024 filed by the DDA is dismissed with cost of Rs. 10,000/- payable to "Advocates' Welfare Fund, Bar Council of Delhi".

33. The said cost shall be deposited by the DDA within a period of two weeks."

(emphasis added)

15. *Mr. Rajat Aneja* therefore states that there is no scope for DDA to again re-agitate this issue, particularly when a decision has already been passed by this Court holding the DDA's officials guilty of contempt.

16. The Court at this stage cannot be invited to re-examine the merits of matter which have already been adjudicated ever since the original order (of which compliance is sought) was passed i.e. relating to assertion of DDA regarding the suspicion of forgery of the original recommendation letter issued by the Land & Building Authority, which finds itself as part of the CBI



investigation. The said assertions, as noted above, had been conclusively considered *first*, in the judgment of 18th March 2021, by the Single Bench; *second*, in the decision dated 6th January 2023 by the Division Bench; and then *third*, by the Supreme Court while assessing the SLP; *fourth*, by the Contempt Court while passing judgment on 27th November 2024, and *fifth*, by the Writ Court while dismissing the modification application of DDA, on 23rd January 2024. There is no scope or reason left for the DDA to contend otherwise and for this Court to embark on a re-determination, re-assessment or review.

17. Senior Counsel for DDA, however, insists that this will still not amount to wilful disobedience of the orders.

18. In these circumstances, the officer concerned, *Mr. Kuldeep Kumar*, Director (Residential Land), is present in Court and has been queried by the Court as to his position in this matter, considering it has been pointed out to him, that in the opinion of this Court, no residual issue remains to be considered *qua* the plea canvassed by DDA. Having been faced with this observation and conclusion by the court, *Mr. Kuldeep Kumar* states that they will issue the requisite conversion within a period of 8 weeks.

19. *Mr. Vasudev* then states that this is without prejudice to their point of view.

20. Notwithstanding, *Mr. Kuldeep Kumar* tenders his unconditional apology for having not complied with orders of this Court, considering that he was constrained by the legal advice received regarding the pendency of the CBI investigation.

21. In any case, these aspects have been considered threadbare raised by the DDA *ad nauseum*, and the matter must rest, a *quietus* must emerge, and therefore the undertaking and apology of *Mr. Kuldeep Kumar* is taken on



record.

22. This petition already stands disposed of by judgment dated 27th November 2024.

23. Considering that compliance report had been sought for purging of the contempt for which matter had been placed, this issue also stands decided in above terms and afore-noted directions; the requisite conversion be issued within a period of 8 weeks.

24. List for '*compliance*' on 21st July 2025.

25. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

MAY 15, 2025/sm/tk