



\$~85

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

+ W.P.(C) 4167/2025

SMT. DARSHNA OHRI & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. P.K. Rawal, Mr. Tarun Agarwal
and Mr. Akhil Singh, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF
DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

02.04.2025

CM APPL.19338/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4167/2025 and CM APPL.19339/2025 (Stay)

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioners seeking that the respondent no.2 (the Sub-Registrar-IV B, D.C. Office Compound, Nand Nagri, Delhi) be directed to remove/delete the word 'disputed' in their ITS entry/record/register in respect of the property bearing No.126, Ram Vihar, Delhi-110092 (hereinafter "the property in dispute").
4. It is submitted that the property of the petitioner being reflected as 'disputed' in the ITS entry/record/register of respondent no.2 is not only causing grave prejudice to the petitioner, but also diminishing the value of the property in question.
5. It is submitted that a Conveyance Deed in respect of the said property



was initially executed in favour of Sh. Subhash Chander Ohri (brother-in-law of petitioner no.1) and Sh. Vijay Kumar Ohri (husband of petitioner no.1), both sons of late Sh. Kedar Nath Ohri (father-in-law of petitioner no.1) by virtue of Conveyance Deed executed on 05.01.1995 duly registered as Document No.2186 in Addl. Book No.I, vol. No.2696 at pages 189 to 191 dt. 26.5.1995 in the office of Sub-Registrar-IV, Delhi.

6. Thereafter, the husband of the petitioner no.1 executed a Will in respect of his 50% undivided share in favour of the petitioner no.1. The said Will was duly registered as Document No.59, in Addl. Book No. I, Vol. No.889 on pages 51 to 52 dt. 06.01.2009 in the office of Sub-Registrar-VIII, Delhi.

7. Upon the death of petitioner no.1's husband on 02.03.2013, the petitioner no.1 became the sole, absolute and exclusive owner in possession of the said 50% undivided share of the entire Built-up Free-hold Residential property No.126, land area measuring 145.81 sq. meters i.e. 174.40 sq. yards (1569.60 sq. ft.), situated in the layout plan of National Cooperative House Building Society Ltd., Ram Vihar, Delhi-110092.

8. Thereafter, the petitioner no.1 executed a Registered Gift Deed by gifting her 50% undivided share in favour of her two sons i.e. the petitioner no.2 (Sh. Pradeep Kumar Ohri) and the petitioner no.3 (Sh. Ashu Ohri). The said Gift Deed is stated to be duly registered with the Office of Sub-Registrar vide Registration No.856 in Book No. I, Vol. No.3579 on pages 49 to 58 dt. 25.01.2023. By virtue thereof, it is stated that the petitioner nos.2 and 3 are the sole co-owners of the property in question and are in possession of their respective portions.

9. The daughter of the petitioner no.1 subsequently filed CS



No.528/2023 at the Karkardooma Courts, Delhi in respect of the property in question. It pointed out that the said civil suit filed by the daughter was dismissed *vide* judgment/order dated 03.08.2024, passed by the District Judge, Shahdara, the Karkardooma Courts, Delhi. It is also pointed out that the said judgment has not been appealed/challenged before any Court of competent jurisdiction.

10. It is submitted that consequent to the dismissal of the said civil suit, there is no outstanding dispute in respect of the property in question and therefore it is completely incongruous and unnecessary to reflect property as 'disputed' in the record of the respondent no.2 or in any other government record.

11. It is submitted that the petitioner has made repeated representations to the respondent no.2 seeking that the concerned property be not reflected as 'disputed'. However, the said representations dated 08.08.2024 and 22.01.2025 have not been responded to by the respondent no.2. It is further submitted the petitioners also issued a legal notice dated 19.02.2025 issued to respondent no.2. Even the same has not been responded to.

12. Considering that there is no outstanding litigation in respect of the property in question and the petitioners appear to have exclusive rights in respect of the property in question, the respondent no.2 is directed to consider the request of the petitioner for correction/updation of the ITS entry/record/register in respect of the property in question.

13. Let the matter be examined by the respondent no.2 and requisite updation/correction, if any, be carried out expeditiously under intimation to the petitioner. Let the same be done within a period of six weeks from today.

14. In case the petitioner is aggrieved with the outcome of the aforesaid



exercise, he shall be at liberty to avail appropriate remedies under law.

15. The petition is disposed of in above terms.

SACHIN DATTA, J

APRIL 2, 2025/cl