



\$~15

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4794/2024**

BRAHMA DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Piyush Aggarwal, Adv.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Neeraj, SPC with Mr. Rudra Paliwal, Mr. Vedansh Anand and Mr. Soumyadip Chakraborty, Adv.**

**for R-1.
Mr. Siddharth Panda, Advocate for R-2/LAC/L&B.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA DHARI SINGH

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA

ORDER

%

16.01.2025

1. The instant writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking the following reliefs:-

“1) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ thereby directing the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for payment of compensation towards her share in the land acquired per Award No. 14A/2009- 10 dated 10.03.2011, pertaining to Village Sultanpur.

2) Issue appropriate order and/or directions to compensate the petitioner for the undue delay caused by the respondents in processing the claim of the petitioner for compensation in lieu of her land acquired compulsorily.

3) which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice.”

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 2 submitted



that in the instant writ petition the limited prayer of the petitioner is his claim, which has been referred to the competent authority/LAC by the learned ADJ vide order dated 27th November, 2018 (appended as Annexure P-7) and that the said claim is still pending for adjudication before the said competent authority.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 2 also submitted that notice dated 16th November, 2021 has already been issued to the petitioner, which is appended as Annexure P-8, and it is undertaken that petitioner's claim shall be decided by the competent authority/LAC, on instructions, within eight weeks.

4. On instructions, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has no objection to the undertaking given by the respondent No. 2 and submitted that the instant writ petition may be disposed of in light of the undertaking given by the learned counsel for the respondent No. 2.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Upon perusal of the contents made in the instant writ petition, it is observed that the petitioner's primary grievance pertains to the fact that her claim for payment of compensation towards her share in the land acquired in terms of Award No. 14A/2009-10, dated 10th March, 2011, has not been processed. Further, the petitioner, by way of the instant petition, is seeking directions to the respondents to process her claim. Therefore, the limited grievance of the petitioner is with regard to the processing of her claim.

7. During the course of the arguments, learned counsel for the respondent No. 2 has, on instructions, given an undertaking before this Court that the petitioner's claim, pending before the competent authority/LAC, shall be decided within a period of eight weeks. Since an



undertaking has been given before this Court and the learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection to the same, nothing remains pending for further adjudication by this Court.

8. Accordingly, in view of the abovesaid undertaking and the no-objection, the respondent No. 2 is directed to process the petitioner's claim within a period of eight weeks.

9. With the aforesaid directions, the instant petition is disposed of along with pending applications, if any.

10. In case the respondent No. 2 fails to decide the claim of the petitioner, as directed hereinabove, the petitioner is at liberty to file an application for renewal of the instant writ petition.

CHANDRA DHARI SINGH, J.

ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J.

JANUARY 16, 2025/R

Click here to check corrigendum, if any