



\$~42

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7934/2024**

NEETU BANSAL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Bibhuti Bhushan Mishra,
Ms. Shivalika, Ms. Rozeline Hussain,
Mr. Ritik Ahuja and Ms. Srishti
Saundarya, Advocates.

versus

THE LAND AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manika Tripathi, SC with
Mr. Rony John, Advocate for DDA.
Ms. Shilpa Ohri, Advocate for MCD.
Mr. GG Kashyap, Mr. Ronvijay
Gohain, Mr. Nishant Pandit and
Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocates for R-
5.
Ms. Aakriti Garg, Advocate for
Mr. Parvinder Chauhan, Advocate for
DUSIB.
Mr. Nishant Gautam, Ms. Sanjana M.,
Mr. Mayank Sharma, Mr. Ajay
Kanojia, Mr. Rudra Rout and
Mr. Vinay Kaushik, Advocates for R-
1, 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

13.09.2024

CM APPL. 53877/2024 (for compliance of final order and judgment dated 28.05.2024)

1. The present application seeks compliance of order dated 28th May,



2024. Through the said order, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, disposed of the petition with a direction to L&DO to conduct a proper enquiry into the matter and to take a decision on the Petitioner's applications as to whether they are entitled to the benefit of INR 3 lakhs or not. The operative portion of the order reads as follows:

"1. Petitioner has approached this Court claiming a sum of Rs.3 lakhs in terms of the Judgment passed by the Apex Court in SLP(C) No. 9300/2023 (Arising from Diary No.12350 of 2022) titled as Vaishali (Minor) (Through Next Friend Mrs. Sita Devi) & Ors. versus Union of India & Ors.

2. It is the contention of the Petitioner that the Petitioners' jhuggis have been demolished without giving them the amount of Rs.3 lakhs, in terms of the Judgment passed by the Apex Court. It is further stated that though the present Petitioners were not Petitioners before the Apex Court but the Judgment passed by the Apex Court will be applicable on the Petitioners as well. It is further stated that applications have been filed by the Petitioners with the L&DO giving proof of their residence but the same are still pending with the L&DO.

3. Without going into the merits of the case, the Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the L&DO to conduct proper enquiry into the matter and decide the applications of the Petitioners as to whether they are entitled to the benefit of Rs.3 lakhs or not. In case it is found that the Petitioners are not entitled to the benefit, the Petitioners are at liberty to take steps in accordance with law. In case the Petitioners are found to be eligible to the said amount, then NBCC is directed to pay the amount to the L&DO for further disbursement to the Petitioners within six weeks from the date of decision of the applications of the Petitioners herein.

4. With these directions, the Writ Petition is disposed of along with the pending applications, if any."

2. As evident from the above extract, it was also observed that in case the Petitioners are found to not be entitled to the benefit, they shall be at liberty to take steps in accordance with law.

3. Mr. Vinay Kaushik, counsel for Respondents No. 1 and 4, apprises the Court that the L&DO has rendered a decision on the Petitioners' applications, holding them to be ineligible for the *ex-gratia* amount of INR 3 lakhs. A copy of the communication has been handed over across the board



and the same is taken on record. A copy thereof has also been supplied to the counsel for Petitioner.

4. In light of the above, in the opinion of the Court, the relief sought in the present application for compliance of the order dated 28th May, 2024 stands redressed. In terms of the Court's directions in the said order, the Petitioners shall now be at liberty to take recourse to appropriate remedies against the decision rendered on their representation. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

5. The application is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 13, 2024

nk