



\$~16 to 18

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

+ W.P.(C) 788/2021 & CM APPL. 27282/2022

RANVIR SINGH RANAPetitioner

Through: Mr. A K Singh, Advocate

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Mr. Ritank
Kumar, Mr. Anil Pandey, Mr.
Shailendra, Advocates

17

+ W.P.(C) 789/2021 & CM APPL. 27295/2022

INDER SINGH SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LR KRISHAN
RANAPetitioner

Through: Mr. A K Singh, Advocate

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Rajneesh Sharma, Mr. Ritank
Kumar, Mr. Anil Pandey, Mr.
Shailendra, Advocates

18

+ W.P.(C) 8785/2021 & CM APPL. 27350/2021

SAMEEN KUMARPetitioner

Through: Mr. A K Singh, Advocate

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Standing
Counsel with Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha,
Mr. Divakar Kapil, Advs



CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

14.11.2025

1. All these three petitions are preferred by persons whose land was acquired and whose request for reference under *Section 18* of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 ("*Act of 1894*") was rejected *vide* orders dated 18th January 2020 and 7th September 2020.
2. Since the facts are similar in all these three petitions, by consent, these petitions are heard and disposed of together.
3. For convenience, we are considering the facts of **W.P.(C) 788/2021** titled as "***Ranvir Singh Rana v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Anr.***"
4. Petitioner claims that his land, which is referred to in petition, was subjected to acquisition under the *Act of 1894* through *Section 4* notification dated 4th February 2010, and an award was passed against the said notification on 1st February 2012.
5. It is the case of petitioner that since the offer under the Award made by the Collector was not accepted, the remedy lies under *Section 18* of the of Act of 1894, and as such, he has chosen to prefer an application under *Section 18* seeking enhanced compensation on 23rd March 2012.
6. Petitioner further submits that the said request was not attended to for a substantial time, and his request for forwarding the reference to the Civil Court came to be rejected *vide* impugned order dated 18th January 2020.
7. Amongst other grounds sought to be canvassed to assail the impugned order dated 18th January 2020 are: (a) that the alleged inquiry



conducted by the office of respondent in the matter of holding that the reference was never submitted, and was done behind the back of petitioner, and such inquiry cannot be held to be binding on petitioner as he was neither given notice nor any opportunity of hearing. As such, the finding recorded that the reference was not legally tendered in the office of the Land Acquisition Collector ('**LAC**'), cannot be accepted or sustained in law; (b) reference was submitted and the certified copies of same were duly made available by the office of LAC, which speaks of the proposal being pending with the respondent; (c) reference preferred by petitioner was within the time stipulated under *Section 18 (2)* of the Act of 1894.

8. As against above, counsel appearing for respondent would urge that of the total references received, **46** references were processed, and all were referred to the concerned Civil Court for adjudication, as there were certain issues in relation to these *46 applications* preferred under *Section 18* of the Act of 1894.

9. It is further claimed that upon an internal inquiry conducted by the LAC, it was found that **36 out of 46** references preferred under *Section 18* were genuine ones and were duly forwarded to the concerned Civil Court. According to him, of the remaining **10** references, the petitioner is concerned with present three petitions, as it is claimed that all three references alleged to have been submitted by petitioner were found to be either having parallel lodging / diary number which is overlapped with other genuinely submitted *Section 18* applications.

10. As such, it is urged that since the inquiry reflects that the petitioner has tried to take undue advantage with the help of some insider from the office of LAC, the references cannot be said to be legally tendered under



Section 18 of the Act of 1894. As such it is prayed that all these three petitions suffer from the suppression of material facts, as the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands by relying on documents which, according to the respondent, are not germane.

11. We have considered the submissions.

12. Proviso to *sub section (2)* of *Section 18* of the Act of 1894 contemplates limitation period within which a reference can be submitted to the office of LAC after the date of award. In the case in hand, the date of award undisputedly, is 1st February 2012, whereas the application under *Section 18* in the form of reference is claimed to be of 23rd/24th March 2012.

13. The respondents claim that an inquiry was conducted and *10 cases* were found to be doubtful as the diary number on these *10 cases* preferred under *Section 18* were overlapping with diary numbers *qua* the other genuine reference cases. It is claimed that the *talathi* and other Revenue Officers were duly examined in the matter and accordingly the report was drawn in relation to the *10 spurious cases*, out of which three references the petitioner is referring to in these petitions were found to be illegally tendered and *prima facie* appear to be time-barred claims hit by *Section 18 (2)*.

14. As far as the internal inquiry is concerned, the fact remains that the petitioner was never put to any notice during such inquiry being conducted *qua* the proposal submitted by him. In case the petitioner had been put to notice in the matter of determining whether the proposal tendered by the petitioner was a spurious one or was lodged against an overlapping diary number, it would have been open to the petitioner to cross-examine the



witnesses or submit his view on the same, which opportunity was not offered to the petitioner.

15. In such an eventuality, the report which was prepared behind the back of the petitioner cannot be relied on for determining petitioner's claim to be spurious or contrary to the scheme or statutory mandate under the *Act of 1894*.

16. That being so, the decision of the respondent claiming that the reference application submitted under *Section 18* by the petitioner cannot be said to be not within time or is spurious or illegal, cannot be sustained.

17. That being so, the order impugned thereby rejecting the application of the petitioner is hereby quashed and set aside.

18. We direct the Collector to forward the reference applications preferred under *Section 18* of the Act of 1894 to the concerned Civil Court within a period of six weeks from the date of production of this order.

19. Pending applications are rendered infructuous.

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

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, J

ANISH DAYAL, J

NOVEMBER 14, 2025/sm/tk