



\$~91

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

+ W.P.(C) 16591/2024

SANJEEV BHALLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yogesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Prashant Manchanda, Additional
Standing Counsel with Ms. Nancy Shah, Advocate
for GNCTD with Mr. Krishan Kumar, Kanungo
and Mr. Jagdeep Singh, Kanungo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

02.12.2024

%

1. This writ petition has been preferred on behalf of the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for a direction to the Respondents to delete the name of the erstwhile seller namely, Kesho Dass Sawhney son of Tara Chand from the records of the land revenue of the State of Delhi with respect to plot bearing land no. 17 measuring 500 sq yards being part of Khasra No. 162/2 situated in Village Burari, Delhi ('subject land') as also for mutation of the name of the Petitioner.
2. Facts to the extent relevant and as averred in the writ petition are that one Sh. Jag Mohan Bhalla had purchased the subject land through a registered Sale Deed vide Registration No. 4566, Addl. Book No. I, Vol. No. 1415 on 05.05.1971 from Kesho Dass Sawhney for a consideration of Rs.1000/-. On 15.05.1971, Sh. Jag Mohan Bhalla had also applied for



mutation of the said plot. Pursuant to this application, notice was also served on the erstwhile seller namely Kesho Dass Sawhney who gave his statement on 16.07.1971 confirming that the subject property had in fact been sold to Sh. Jag Mohan Bhalla on 12.05.1971 through a registered Sale Deed vide Registration No. 4566, Addl. Book No. I, Vol. No. 1415. The statement was recorded by the concerned Patwari, however, it is averred that subsequently the subject land had been taken over because of Chakbandi which had taken place approximately in 1977 and various lands were replaced in different Khasras.

3. From the information received under Right to Information Act, 2005, Petitioner learnt that the subject land was part of the Khasra No. 162/2 situated in the area of Village Burari and had been mutated in the name of erstwhile seller. Unfortunately, Sh. Jag Mohan Bhalla expired on 25.06.2006 whereafter Petitioner had been consistently pursuing the case for mutation from 2008, save and except, for an intermittent period during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Petitioner avers that he has written letters to all the concerned authorities but so far there has been no response compelling him to approach this Court.

4. Issue notice.

5. Mr. Prashant Manchanda, learned Additional Standing Counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondents.

6. Looking at the facts averred in the writ petition, in my view, it would be appropriate to dispose of this writ petition, without entering into merits of the case, by directing Respondents No. 2 and 3 to examine the grievance of the Petitioner as ventilated in the writ petition as aforementioned, as also taking into account the details of the registration of the Sale Deed mentioned



in the present writ petition, treating the petition as a representation. Needless to state that, if after examination of the records, Revenue Officials are of the view that the matter is to proceed for mutation, necessary action will be taken, however, if the decision is otherwise, a reasoned and speaking order shall be passed. The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible but not later than 04 months from today. The order, if any, will be communicated to the Petitioner within a period of one week from the decision. Liberty is given to the Petitioner to take recourse to legal remedies, in case of any surviving grievance.

JYOTI SINGH, J

DECEMBER 02, 2024/shivam