



\$~11

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14705/2022**

SHRI BHAGWAN SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr N.S. Dalal with Ms Nidhi Dalal,
Mr Alok Kumar, Ms Rachana Dalal
and Mr Karan Mann, Advocates.

versus

A.D.M./L.A.C. NORTH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Sanjay K. Pathak with Mr Sunil
K. Jha, Mr M.S. Akhtar, Mr Sami S.
Siddiqui and Mr Mayank Madhu,
Advocates for R1/LAC.
Mr V.P. Rana with Mr Siddharth
Shankar, Advocates for R2 to R9.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

03.03.2025

%

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that directions be issued to respondent no.1 (hereafter *LAC*) to release the payment of compensation in terms of the order dated 28.03.2022. In terms of the said order, the LAC had directed that the compensation awarded in respect of 1/3rd share of the subject land [land comprising in Khasra No. 936/1(3-08) acquired in terms of Award No. 1 of 2015-2016/DC/North dated 19.12.2015] located in Village Siraspur, Delhi be released to the petitioner subject to the petitioner furnishing indemnity bond/surety bond/affidavit, sureties and other legal formalities. Notwithstanding the said



order, the compensation has not been released to the petitioner. It is material to note that the order dated 28.03.2022 expressly provided that the same would be subject to the order passed by the Financial Commissioner in an appeal that was pending before the said authorities. Paragraph VIII of the said order indicates that the petitioner's application was objected to by one Shri Krishan son of Late Sh. Inder Singh. He had also challenged the mutation of the subject land in favour of the petitioner and reference in the said order is to the appeal against the order relating to mutation of the said property, which was pending before the Financial Commissioner.

2. It is also material to note that the said objector had informed the LAC that an application under Section 18 and 30 – 31 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereafter *the LA Act*) was made by him on 08.06.2016 but the reference had not been forwarded to the concerned court.

3. Mr Pathak, the learned counsel appearing for the LAC submits that in fact, reference has since been made under Section 76 and 77 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereafter *the 2013 Act*) which are *pari materia* to Sections 30 and 31 of the LA Act.

4. Clearly, in view of the above, the compensation is required to be deposited with the concerned court, which is in seisin of the said reference and this court has informed that the said compensation has in fact been deposited with the concerned court.

5. In view of the above, the relief as sought for by the petitioner cannot be granted.

6. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner requests that direction be issued to the concerned court (District Judge-02, West District,



Tis Hazari Courts) for an expeditious disposal of the said reference. None of the parties have any objection to the same. In view of the above, we request the concerned authority to consider the reference (LAC-12/24 captioned *UOI v. Bhagwan Singh*) as expeditiously as possible.

7. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

TEJAS KARIA, J

MARCH 03, 2025/tr