



\$~11

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

+ W.P.(C) -11747/2023

VIDAYA DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Dr. Meenakshi Kalra, Mr. S.N. Kalra, Mr. Kamal, Ms. G. Meghana, Ms. Rushali Sikand and Ms. Anjali Chaudhary, Advocates.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Shivani Yadav, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

15.01.2025

%

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, for a direction upon the respondents to allot a property to her in lieu of acquired land.
2. The petitioner's case is that the land belonging to her husband at *Samlat 1561, Village Mohammadpur, Munirka, New Delhi*, was acquired, and an application was thereafter made for allotment of alternative land. It is the case of the petitioner that she was informed that the allotment of alternative land to her was, in fact, approved in the year 1993. My attention is drawn to a communication dated 24.03.1993, by which certain documents were sought from the petitioner. According to the petitioner, the documents were duly submitted.
3. However, the petitioner states that she did not receive any final



order of allotment or communication with regard to her request and therefore approached this Court thirty years later. The petitioner sought information from the respondent's office under the Right to Information Act, 2005, in the year 2020 but has been informed that the file is not readily available and that a reply would be given once the file is traced.

4. In these circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks a direction that the respondents will consider the case and communicate orders made, if any, to the petitioner.

5. While issuing notice in this case on 05.09.2023, the Court noticed the delay in the filing of the case but directed that the matter be listed alongwith W.P.(C) 2313/2017 filed by other family members of the original land owner.

6. The said writ petition has been disposed of today with the following directions:

“10. In these circumstances, GNCTD is directed to address a comprehensive communication to the petitioner, detailing the facts and grounds if the petitioner's request is to be rejected, within eight weeks.”

7. In view of the fact that in the present case, no order has been communicated to the petitioner at all, learned counsel states that she would be satisfied with a similar order.

8. Despite time having been granted for filing of counter affidavits for the first time on 08.01.2024, no counter affidavit has yet been filed. In these circumstances, I am of the view that it would be appropriate to dispose of the writ petition on the same terms. The respondents are directed to examine the matter and communicate any orders which have already been passed or to pass fresh orders thereupon to the petitioner



within a period of eight weeks from today.

9. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 15, 2025/MR/JM/