



\$~46

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

+ LPA 109/2025, CM APPL.Nos. 8565/2025 & 8566/2025

POONAM HANDOO

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Swarnendu Chatterjee,
Ms. Deepakshi Garg and Ms. Harshita
Rawat, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY THROUGH ITS VICE
CHAIRMAN

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu and Mr. Hardik
Saxena, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

13.02.2025

%

CM APPL. 8566/2025

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CM APPL. 8565/2025

3. Cause shown is sufficient. Accordingly, the application is allowed.
Delay of 116 days in filing the appeal is condoned.
4. The application stands disposed of.

LPA 109/2025

5. Heard learned counsel representing the parties.
6. While instituting the proceedings of the instant Letters Patent Appeal,
the appellant/petitioner challenges the order dated 30.08.2024 passed by the



learned Single Judge whereby WP(C)No.11998/2024 filed by the appellant/petitioner has been dismissed.

7. The prayer made in the writ petition was to set aside the reply dated 05.07.2024 given by the Delhi Development Authority (hereinafter referred to as 'DDA') on the representation preferred by the appellant. Further a direction was also sought to be issued to the DDA to conduct an inquiry into the various representations submitted by the appellant, dated 31.01.2024 and 18.06.2024.

8. It has been argued by learned counsel representing the appellant/petitioner that while furnishing the reply to the representation made by the appellant, DDA has not looked into the grievances raised therein by the appellant/petitioner and as such learned Single Judge has erred while dismissing the writ petition.

9. Having heard learned counsel for the appellant and also learned counsel representing the DDA, we are not inclined to interfere in the instant Letters Patent Appeal for the reason that learned Single Judge has given sustainable reasons for not interfering with the writ petition filed by the appellant/petitioner.

10. The grievance raised by the appellant/petitioner in the writ petition was in relation to certain conveyance deed in respect of a house which is owned by her mother-in-law. DDA while taking decision on the representation preferred by the appellant/petitioner has stated that the personal/family feud cannot be gone into by the DDA and further that the appellant/petitioner was not related to the property in any manner; neither does she have any tenable claim, so far as the conveyance deed is concerned.

11. Learned Single Judge has returned a finding that *prima facie* there is



no legal right much less the fundamental right available to the appellant/petitioner which warranted interference in the writ petition. We are in complete agreement with the reasons given by the learned Single Judge while dismissing the writ petition.

12. Consequently, the instant Letters Patent Appeal also fails, which is hereby dismissed.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

FEBRUARY 13, 2025/mk