



\$~125

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

+ W.P.(C) 4647/2025

AJAY SACHDEVA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Alok Kumar, Mr. Mohit Kumar
and Mr. Kunal Prakash, Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ravikant Srivastava, Sr. Panel
Counsel for R1.

Mr. Akhil Mittal, ASC with Mr. Sidhant Garg,
Advocate for DDA/R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

15.04.2025

CM APPL. No. 21503/2025

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

W.P.(C) 4647/2025 and CM APPL. No. 21504/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking following reliefs:

“a. Pass a Writ of Mandamus or appropriate Writ in favour of the Petitioners and against the Respondent No. 2 & 3, thereby directing them for compliance with the request letter for regularisation of the suit property bearing No. T-1881/2, Upper Ridge Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005 in favour of Petitioner;

b. Pass a Writ of Mandamus or appropriate Writ in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondent No.2, thereby,



directing the Respondent to convert the property from leasehold to free-hold subject to the payment as per the Gadgil Assurance Scheme.

c. Pass a Writ of Mandamus or appropriate Writ in favour of the Petitioner and against Respondent No.1, thereby directing Respondent No.1 to provide alternative accommodation in favour of the Petitioner against the suit property as per the Gadgil Assurance Scheme, if necessary.

d. Cost of this petition be awarded in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondents for their non-compliances.”

4. Mr. Alok Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the property in question was allotted by the respondent/DDA to the grandfather of the petitioner, who expired on 01.01.1992. The grandmother of the petitioner also passed away subsequently on 17.01.1999. He submits that property was then inherited by the petitioner's father namely, Om Prakash Sachdeva, who also passed away on 03.07.2014.

5. He submits that the petitioner has been requesting for the regularization of the property since 2014, however, the request of the petitioner has not yielded any result.

6. In view of above, issue notice.

7. Mr. Akhil Mittal, learned Additional Standing Counsel on behalf of respondent nos. 2 and 3, accepts notice.

8. Mr. Ravi Kant Srivatava, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.1 also accepts notice.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as of now, the petitioner will be satisfied if a direction is given to the respondent nos.2 and



3 to treat the present writ petition as a representation and dispose of the same by a speaking order.

10. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent nos. 2 and 3/DDA submits that he has no objection in case such a direction is passed.

11. In view of the above, the petition is disposed of with a direction that respondent/DDA shall treat the present writ petition as a representation and dispose of the same by way of a speaking and reasoned order within a period of 12 weeks from today.

12. Copy of the speaking order shall be communicated to the petitioner within a period of one week from the date of the order.

13. Needless to state, petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the Court against the speaking order, if so advised.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 15, 2025/jg