



\$~94

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 794/2025**

LACHMAN DASS

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ujala Vnishnoi Advocate and Mr.
Randeep Singh, Advs.

versus

N SARAVANA KUMAR

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Shahana Farah, Advocate with
Mr. Abhigyan, Advocate for DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

19.05.2025

1. This petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of order dated 10th January 2025 passed by this Court in **W.P.(C) 1508/2014** in the context of an allotment of an alternative flat by the DDA in 1985 to the petitioner, after his shop was burnt in 1984 riots. Despite making payments, he did not receive possession.
2. On 10th January 2025, this Court had directed as under:



45. Keeping in mind the fact that various documents were submitted by the petitioner and his name also figured in the survey conducted by DDA and the fact that allotment was also made way back on 16.04.1985 to him, there was no justifiable or rational reason for DDA to have cancelled the allotment on the premises that he was unable to prove possession of old site at Zakhira. Instead of taking holistic view of the matter, particularly keeping in mind the purpose and objective of the policy, DDA rather chose to adopt a very pedantic and narrow-minded stance. Such approach, clearly, mitigates against its own policy.

46. Consequently, present petition is allowed and order dated 21.10.2010 is quashed.

47. As a necessary 'corollary', respondent-DDA is directed to handover physical possession of plot/shop bearing no. 253, Block BC, Mangol Puri Phase-II Industrial Area, Delhi to the petitioner within ten weeks from today.

48. It is also ordered that in case the aforesaid premises plot has already been allotted to someone else, some other plot of same size and preferably in the same area be given to the petitioner.

49. It is also made clear that since petitioner had already made the entire consideration amount way back in the year 1985 respondent-DDA shall not seek any further payment from him for such alternative plot.

50. Needless to say, since plot was to be given on leasehold basis, conveyance deed be also executed in favour of the petitioner for the aforesaid plot alternate plot within the aforesaid period of ten weeks.

3. *Ms. Shahana Farah*, counsel for DDA appears on advance Notice and on instructions, states that there is no question of non-compliance and they will fully comply with the same within the next four weeks.

4. This is acceptable to counsel for petitioner, and he does not press this petition, basis this submission by counsel for DDA.



5. Accordingly, petition is disposed of.
6. Liberty is given to the petitioner to revive the petition in case there is any continued infraction.
7. It is made clear that even despite these directions, if the compliance is not made within the next four weeks, concerned Officer will be liable for proceedings under contempt and litigation costs which will have to be paid to alleviate the misery of the petitioner in this regard.
8. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

MAY 19, 2025/RK/na

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)