



\$~118

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

% ***Date of Decision: 11th November, 2024***

+ **W.P.(C) 15658/2024 & CM APPL. 65629/2024**

KIRAN ARORA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manish Sharma with Mr. Ninad
Dogra and Ms. Adya Rao, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Katyal, Standing Counsel
for DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

JUDGMENT (oral)

1. Petitioner is stated to be a senior citizen who contends that she has been compelled to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court on account to total inaction on the part of the respondent Authority.

2. According to the petitioner, she had purchased property in question i.e. First Floor, Plot No.57, Mandakini Plotted Housing Society (NRI Complex), New Delhi way back in the year 1997. She approached respondent - Delhi Development Authority (DDA), time and again, for the purposes of conversion of her said property into a freehold one and even executed various documents, as were advised by the respondent from time to time. She also deposited the 'conversion charges' way back in the year 2017. However, she submits that she has not received any concrete response and,



therefore, the present petition has been filed seeking issuance of a writ directing DDA to do the needful.

3. Learned counsel for DDA appears on advance notice and states that he is yet to receive any instruction in this regard, either way. He, however, does admit that as per the contentions made in the petition, the petitioner seems to be raising her grievance for quite some time.

4. The averments made in the petition have been gone into and keeping in mind the overall facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the petitioner is a senior citizen, the present petition is disposed of with direction to the respondent DDA to consider the request made by the petitioner regarding conversion of her property from *leasehold to freehold* within *ten weeks* from today, in accordance with law.

5. Needless to say, in case any document is required to be submitted further by the petitioner for the purposes of enabling the respondent to do the needful conversion, the petitioner would supply the same and the time taken by her during such supply of documents shall be excluded from the aforesaid period of ten weeks. It is expected that if there is any such requirement, the respondent Authority would send requisite communication in this regard to the petitioner within three weeks from today.

6. It is, however, clarified that this Court has not made any observation with respect to the fact whether the property in question can be converted into freehold or not and it will be entirely upto the



concerned Authority to take appropriate decision in this regard in accordance with law.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 11, 2024
st