



\$~108

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

% ***Date of Decision: 11th March, 2025***

+ **W.P.(C) 3041/2025 & CM APPL. 14445/2025**

NIRDOSH BHAMBRI

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Pramod Kumar Singh with Mr. Hem Kumar and Mr. Rajeev Kumar, Advocates.**

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: **Ms. Beenashaw N Soni, ASC with Ms. Ann Joseph, Advocates**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. The issue raised in the present petition is very short and precise.
2. The flat in question is flat bearing No. 02, Ek Jot Apartments, Road No. 44, Pitampura, Delhi-110034.
3. Petitioner herein had applied for transfer and conversion of the above said flat in his name and while applying for such transfer and conversion, he had submitted several documents including indemnity bond, affidavit of Bhupinder Bhambri (his brother) and *No Objection Certificate* of the Society.
4. While processing such request, Delhi Development Authority found that the documents submitted by the petitioner were forged and fabricated.
5. Even the NOC allegedly issued by the society was found to be forged.



6. A show cause notice was issued to the petitioner and since, the reply submitted by him was not found satisfactory, the transfer of half share in his name was suspended vide letter dated 14.11.2022.
7. A criminal case was also registered which is, reportedly, under investigation. DDA, keeping in mind the fact that documents furnished by the petitioner were found to be false and holding it to be a case of mis-statement of facts, the transfer request was cancelled on 23.01.2025 and simultaneously, petitioner as well as his said brother were directed not to create any third party interest in respect of the above said flat.
8. The challenge in the present writ petition is with respect to the above said cancellation order dated 23.01.2025.
9. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that there is already a civil suit pending adjudication before the Court of learned Civil Judge (Rohini Courts). It has been filed by the petitioner against his brother-Mr. Bhupinder Bhambri.
10. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that plaintiff is seeking declaration that he be declared owner of the above said flat.
11. Learned counsel for respondent appears on advance notice and submits that the dispute is, essentially, between the two brothers and if there is a judgment in favour of petitioner i.e. plaintiff, and the copy thereof is duly supplied to them, they would consider the matter afresh, in accordance with law.
12. She also submits that, for the reasons best known to the petitioner, DDA is not even a party to the above said civil suit.
13. Be that as it may, in view of the above said assurance given by learned counsel for DDA, petitioner does not, at the moment, pray for any further relief in the matter.



2025:DHC:1642



14. Petition, is accordingly, disposed of in the aforesaid terms.
15. It is however, clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case as such.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MARCH 11, 2025/sw/pb