



\$~71

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4158/2025**

GAYATRI CHOPRA AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Smita Maan, Mr. Vishal
Maan, Ms. Sakshi Sejwal,
Advocates.

versus

**DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF
FOREST AND ORS. & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Appearance not given.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **02.04.2025**

CM APPL. 19322/2025 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4158/2025 & CM APPL. 19321/2025 (stay)

1. The petitioners have filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution on the allegation that they are being threatened with dispossession, and demolition of a boundary wall constructed on their private property, *ad-measuring 4 bighas 12 biswas and 04 biswansi*, in *Khasra Nos. 83/5 min, 83/6 min, and 83/7min, situated in village Jaunapur, New Delhi* ["subject land"].
2. The petitioners seek a direction upon the respondents restraining them from carrying out any further demolition or coercive action in



respect of the subject land and a direction to carry out a fresh demarcation.

3. In support of the petitioners' contention, copies of land revenue records and title documents, including the Sale Deed, also accompanied by a Land Status Report issued by the Revenue Authorities, which classifies the land as agricultural land, have been placed on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner also relies upon a demarcation map [annexed at Annexure P-9 to the writ petition], which is stated to be taken from the respondents' record. It shows the petitioners' subject land as part of "non forest land". Learned counsel also relies upon orders passed by this Court in similar cases directing demarcation and maintenance of *status quo* in the interregnum. She draws my attention to an order dated 20.10.2022 in W.P.(C) 9606/2022 in this connection. The operative directions concerned in the said order were for the petitioners to file a detailed representation before the Revenue and Forest Authorities and for *status quo* to be maintained by both parties therein until the lapse of 15 days after disposal of the writ petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a similar order may be passed in the present petition also.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents, who appears on advance notice, submits that the appropriate authority to identify the forest land is the Forest Settlement Officer ["FSO"], and the demarcation would also be carried out by the Revenue Authorities in coordination with the FSO. As it happens, the FSO is the Additional District Magistrate of the area.

5. Having regard to these submissions, I am of the view that the appropriate resolution of the matter would lie in identification of the forest land and demarcation of the petitioners' land. The respondents are



directed to treat the writ petition as a representation and take necessary action within a period of two months from today.

6. Until then, *status quo* will be maintained both by the petitioners and the State authorities with regard to the subject land. It is made clear that the petitioners will not carry out any construction whatsoever on the subject land, until these directions have been implemented.

7. After the decision on the representation, the order of *status quo* will continue until fifteen days to enable the petitioners to invoke their legal remedies, if required.

8. The writ petition, alongwith the pending application, is disposed with the aforesaid observations.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 2, 2025

'Bhupi/JM'/'