



\$~26

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

%

Date of Decision: 6th March, 2025+ W.P.(C) 14262/2021
NAKUL MANUJA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kanisth Manuja and Mr. Gaurav
Manuja, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Shahana Farah and Ms. Sanna
Harta, Advocates.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that on account of some inadvertent error, a sum of Rs.2,90,000/- was deposited by the petitioner in the account of one Mr. Naresh Chand, whereas it was supposed to be deposited by him in the account of his uncle-Mr. Gopal Das Chhokro.
2. He also submits that there was no outstanding in the abovesaid account of Mr. Naresh Chand and such amount is virtually lying surplus there and, therefore, the respondent should have rather returned the abovesaid amount, without intervention of the Court.
3. After hearing arguments for some time, learned counsel for petitioner submits that he would not press the present writ petition, provided the present petition is treated as representation by the respondent-Authority and they decide the same expeditiously.



4. Learned counsel for DDA, without prejudice to their rights and contentions, has no objection to said proposal.
5. In view of the above, the present petition be treated as representation and the respondent-Authority shall decide the same as expeditiously as possible and preferably within eight weeks from today.
6. If the petitioner is directed by respondent to produce any document with respect to the deposit of the abovesaid amount, it is expected that petitioner shall produce the same forthwith so that the representation is decided, without any further delay.
7. Needless to say, respondent shall also be at liberty to take response, if required, from abovesaid Mr. Naresh Chand, before taking any final decision in the matter.
8. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MARCH 6, 2025/ss/kt