



\$~135

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6637/2025**

SHRI SURENDER RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Setu Niket and Ms. Esha
Mazumdar, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ORS.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhana Takiar, SC with Mr.
Kuljeet Singh, Adv. for DDA.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with
Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr. M.s.
Akhtar, Mr. Sami Sameer and Mr.
Divakar Kapil, Advs. for R-3/LAC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

16.05.2025

CM APPL. 30154/2025 (exemption)

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

W.P.(C) 6637/2025 & CM APPL. 30153/2025

3. The present petition has been filed seeking following relief:

“A. Issue a Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate Writ, Order or direction of like nature, quashing and setting aside Notice no.F4(5)/Notice/SD-IV/RPD-3/DDA/13 dated 01.05.2025;

B. Issue a Writ of Prohibition or any other appropriate Writ, Order or direction of like nature, permanently restraining the Respondents from disturbing the possession of the Petitioner on land bearing (30/60 bhag) Kh. No.



46/23(1-14) and 46/24(1-6), Vill: Shahbad Daulatpur, New Delhi;

C. Issue a Writ of Prohibition or any other appropriate Writ, Order or direction of like nature, permanently restraining the Respondents from demolishing the buildings of the Petitioner constructed on land bearing (30/60 bhag) Kh. No. 46/23(1-14) and 46/24(1-6), Vill: Shahbad Daulatpur, New Delhi.;”

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the grievance articulated in the present petition is that a notice dated 01.05.2025 has been affixed by the respondent/DDA alleging that the petitioner is occupying the land of the DDA.
5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially, the LAC had issued a notice under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 in respect of petitioner's land, which was followed by declaration under Section 6 of the said Act. However, the petitioner had challenged the same and the matter went up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court and an order was passed setting aside the declaration under Section 6, as well as, the order under Section 17 of the Act.
6. He submits that subsequently fresh Section 6 declaration was issued under the Act, however, the same was also challenged and finally quashed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court *vide* judgment dated 11.11.2016. He, therefore, contends that the land does not belong to the DDA.
7. He further contends that the petitioner had also made a representation to the respondent/DDA on 13.05.2025, a copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P-7 to the present petition.
8. He submits that for the time being the petitioner will be satisfied in



case directions are given to the respondent DDA to consider the said representation and pass a speaking order.

9. In view of the above, issue notice.

10. Ms. Shobhana Takiar, the learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of DDA accepts notice.

11. Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, the learned standing counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.3 also accepts notice.

12. Ms. Takiar, on instructions, submits that she has no objections in case appropriate directions are given.

13. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with direction to the DDA to decide the representation dated 13.05.2025 (Annexure P-7) submitted by the petitioner to respondent/DDA by passing a speaking order within a period of 15 days.

14. The order passed in the representation may be communicated to the petitioner within a period of two weeks thereafter.

15. The petition along with pending application stands disposed of in above terms.

16. It is further directed that till the time the decision is taken by the respondent/DDA on the representation of the petitioner, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner's land.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

MAY 16, 2025

N.S. ASWAL