



\$~72

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

+ W.P.(C) 2466/2025 & CM APPL. 11649/2025

SATPAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. K.G. Seth, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Subhash Tanwar, CGSC with
Mr. Sandeep Mishra, Mr. Naveen
and Ms. Bhavi Garg, Advocates
for UOI.

Ms. Manika Tripathi, SC for DDA
with Mr. Gauta Yadav, Advocate.

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with
Mrs. K.Kaomudi Kiran, Mr. Sunil
Kumar Jha and Mr. M.S.Akhtar,
Advocates for R-1 and 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

27.02.2025

1. This writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs:

(a) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents that the third writ petition may kindly be accepted in the interest of justice and the land 250 sq. yds may kindly be given to the humble petitioner, in the interest of justice. First Writ Petition was WP/C No. 4329/2014 annexed at Page 224-238 and order in 2nd W.P (C) No. 2536/2020 on 243-244.

(b) Pass any other and further order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in favour of the petitioner and against the respondents."

2. It may be noted that the petitioner had earlier filed W.P.(C) 4329/2014 on 10.07.2014 against rejection of his application seeking

W.P.(C) 2466/2025

Page 1 of 4



allotment of an alternative plot. By order dated 31.08.2016, the writ petition was dismissed, holding that the entire land of the petitioner had not been acquired, and he was, therefore, not entitled to allotment in terms of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Delhi Development Administration v. Jai Singh Kanwar* [CA No. 8289/2010, dated 14.09.2011].

3. The petitioner thereafter filed W.P.(C) 2536/2020, seeking a direction of restoration for possession of certain land which, according to the petitioner, had been illegally taken by the respondents. By an order dated 04.03.2020 [which has not been placed on record in the writ petition, but is handed over by learned counsel for the respondents], the petitioner was granted liberty to move an application for demarcation of his land before the Tehsildar. The Court noted the submission of learned counsel for respondent No.3- Land and Building Department [“Department”] that the land in question had not been acquired, and possession thereof was not with the Department.

4. The petitioner has filed an order dated 20.04.2022 in W.P.(C) 2536/2020, from which it appears that the writ petition was then re-opened and reserved for orders. However, the final order in the said writ petition has not been placed on record.

5. The petitioner seems to have filed another writ petition, being W.P.(C) 13742/2019, in which directions were given to the respondents to decide the petitioner’s application for allotment of alternative land. His application was rejected by the Recommendation Committee by order dated 14.12.2023, which was passed in terms of order dated 26.04.2022 in W.P.(C) 1236/2020.



6. The aforesaid writ petition and the orders passed therein have again not been placed on record. Instead, the petitioner has filed a copy of an order dated 27.05.2024 passed in CONT.CAS(C) 1264/2022, wherein the Court rejected his contention that the respondents were in breach of order dated 26.04.2022 in W.P.(C) 13742/2019, instead, liberty was given to the petitioner to challenge the order dated 14.12.2023. The petitioner approached the Supreme Court against the aforesaid order [Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No(s).28179/2024], which was dismissed by order dated 17.12.2024, noting that this Court had granted liberty to the petitioner.

7. Even after the order dated 17.12.2024, this is the second writ petition filed by the petitioner. The first [W.P.(C) 1054/2025], was withdrawn on 28.01.2025, with liberty to file a fresh petition on the same cause of action, with a proper memo of parties, proper pleadings and annexures.

8. However, even in this writ petition, no challenge has been laid to the order dated 14.12.2023, by which the petitioner's application for allotment of an alternate plot was rejected. Furthermore, the proceedings, already filed by the petitioner, which seem to encompass at least 4 or 5 earlier writ petitions, and the order passed therein, have not been placed on record.

9. Such filing of repeated writ petitions without proper averments, annexures or prayers, requires an unnecessary expenditure of judicial resources. As a final opportunity, the petitioner is permitted to withdraw this writ petition, with liberty to file a proper writ petition with all necessary facts, documents and prayers. It is specifically directed that any



writ petition will contain details of the previous petitions filed by the petitioner on this issue, and the orders passed therein.

10. In the event the petitioner persists in filing incomplete petitions on which his rights cannot be properly adjudicated, no further liberty will be granted.

11. The writ petition, alongwith pending application, is dismissed as withdrawn, with the aforesaid observations.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2025
SS/SD/