



\$~105

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5126/2025**

HANSRAJ SOLANKI

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Rajbir Singh and Mr. Umesh
Yadav, Advocates.**

versus

ADM (LA) SOUTH WEST & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with
Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr. M.S.
Akhtar, Mr. Sami Sameer Siddiqui
and Mr. Divakar Kapil, Advocates
for R-1.**

**Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Panel Counsel
GNCTD, with Ms. Chandrika
Sachdev and Mr. Dhruv Kumar,
Advocates for R- 2 and 3.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

23.04.2025

%

1. The petitioner claims to be a joint owner in possession of 5/48th share of land comprised in *Khata no. 96/88 Khasra no. 1 etc. 178 (5-9), 180 (5-7), 212(11-13), 249 (30-8), 302 (45-7), 464 (0-12), 475 (10-18) 511 (4-2) and 636 (6-19) total area measuring 121 Bigha 05 Biswas of revenue estate of village Mundhela Khurd, Tehsil Najafgarh, New Delhi.*
2. On 22.11.2024, the petitioner applied for grant of a No Objection Certificate under the Delhi Lands (Restrictions on Transfer) Act, 1972, for a proposed sale of his share in the land. His request has not been

W.P.(C) 5126/2025

Page 1 of 3



acceded on the ground that consolidation proceedings are pending in the village in question. The petitioner has extracted a printout from the relevant portal of the Delhi Government to this effect [Annexure A].

3. Mr. Rajbir Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that in respect of the same village, another similar case has been decided by this Court in *Jalbir Singh & Ors v. ADM (LA) South West & Ors.* [W.P.(C) 4508/2025, decided on 08.04.2025]. Relying upon orders in *Okaya Infocom Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Anr.* [W.P.(C) 12122/2021, decided on 10.11.2023] and *Deepak v. A D M LA South West & Ors.* [W.P.(C) 3103/2021, decided on 15.02.2023] [which deals with the same village], the writ petition was disposed of with the following directions:

“8. Having regard to the above, the writ petition is disposed of with the direction that if the sale deed is presented for registration, the same shall not be refused for want of a NOC or land status report. However, the sale deed shall include a specific clause with regard to the pendency of the consolidation proceedings, recording that the intending purchaser shall take the land subject to the outcome of the consolidation proceedings. An undertaking of the intending purchaser or their nominee to this effect, will be incorporated in the sale deed.

9. It is also made clear that the registration of the sale deed in these terms will have no effect on the rights of any third parties arising out of the consolidation proceedings.”

4. In the present case also, Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, learned counsel for Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi [“GNCTD”], submits that consolidation proceedings, with regard to the village in question, remain pending, but does not point out any material differences from the cases referred to above.

5. Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, learned counsel for respondent No. 1, also confirms that the land in question is not the subject matter of any



acquisition.

6. In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of in terms of the directions contained in paragraph Nos. 8 and 9 of *Jalbir Singh* (supra), as reproduced above.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 23, 2025
SS/AD/