



\$~5

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

+ W.P.(C) 8459/2024 & CM APPL. 34885/2024 (stay)

SH BRIJ LAL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kunal Rawat, Ms. Dolly Verma,
Ms. H. D. S. Rawat and Mr. Shivam
Pandey, Advocates

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashim Vachher, Mr. Vinayak
Uniyal and Ms. Saiba M. Rajpal,
Advocate for R-1/DDA

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN

ORDER

% **19.07.2024**

1. The present petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution to set aside the impugned order dated 15.04.2024 passed by the Court of District Judge, North-West, Rohini Courts, Delhi in case titled as **Brij Lal and Ors V Delhi Development Authority** in PPA no. 1/24 whereby the appeal of the petitioners which was filed to impugn the order dated 10.09.2018 wherein the petitioner Sunita Kumari Arora, who was the ex-allottee of the plot no.421, Pocket-4, Block-B, Sector-8, Rohini, Delhi measuring area 25.90 sq. meters or any part thereof was directed to hand over the physical possession of the said premises along with built up structure within 15 days from the date of the order.

2. The property as detailed hereinabove was allotted to Smt. Sunita Kumari Arora which was stated to be cancelled by the Hon'ble LG vide



order dated 24.07.2017 on account of misuse of the property. The petitioners are claiming to have purchased the said property from Smt. Sunita Kumari Arora.

3. The petitioners being aggrieved by the order passed the Estate officer filed an appeal under section 9(1) of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 bearing PPA no. 1/24 which was ordered to be dismissed vide impugned order dated 15.04.2024 on the ground of limitation.

4. The appellant court has observed that there was an unexplained delay of 5 years 3 months 23 days in filing the appeal before the appellant court and the petitioners were having knowledge about passing of the order dated 10.09.2018. The perusal of impugned order dated 15.04.2024 reflects that it was passed on the sound reasons and does not call any interference.

5. Accordingly, the present petition along with pending application stands dismissed.

DR. SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN, J

JULY 19, 2024

sk/ak