



\$~12

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10851/2025 & CM APPL. 44811/2025**

ADITYA VIKRAM BANSAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Ms. Tanya Aggarwal, Mr. Kushal Gupta, Advocates.

versus

**GOVT. OF NATIONAL CAPITAL
TERRITORY OF DELHI & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with Ms. K.K. Kiran Pathak, Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha and Mr. Md. Suebakhtar, Advocates for R-1.
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, SC DDA with Ms. Deepsha L. Kakar, Mr. Aditya Verma and Ms. Kavya Shukla, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

14.08.2025

1. By order dated 25.07.2025, it was recorded as follows:

"1. Issue notice. Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, learned Standing Counsel, accepts notice on behalf respondent No. 1- Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi ["GNCTD"], and Ms. Shobhana Takiar, learned Standing Counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2- Delhi Development Authority ["DDA"].

2. The petitioner claims to be the owner and in possession of land bearing Khasra No. 550/4 (0-19), Village Satbari, New Delhi ["subject land"].

3. By way of this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioner assails an order dated 12.07.2025, issued by the Additional



District Magistrate (South), GNCTD, by which the subject land is scheduled for “demolition/handing over of possession of the acquired land” on 28.07.2025.

4. The case made out by the petitioner is that the land in question was subject to notification under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1984 [“the Act”], dated 25.11.1980. A notification under Section 6 of the Act was thereafter, issued on 27.05.1985, which was challenged by the petitioner’s predecessor-in-interest namely, Popular Skin Company, in CWP No. 991/1986. During the pendency of the said petition, the writ petitioner therein was protected by interim orders dated 05.05.1986 and 05.08.1986. The respondents however, issued an award dated 26.05.1987 [Award No. 14/87-88] under Section 11 of the Act. CWP No. 991/1986 was allowed by the Division Bench of this Court on 14.09.2001, in view of the judgment in B.R. Gupta v. Union of India and Others [1988 SCC OnLine Del 367]. The copies of the aforesaid judgments have been placed on record.

5. The petitioner herein purchased the subject land from one Smt. Farhat Sheikh in the year 2024. At the time of transfer in the petitioner’s favour, a land status report was issued, specifically stating that the land is free from acquisition.

6. It may be noted that impugned order dated 12.07.2025 refers to Award No. 14/87-88, which, according to the petitioner, was acquisition proceedings challenged in CWP No. 991/1986, and ultimately quashed by this Court.

7. Mr. Pathak submits, upon instructions, that that the proposed action has been taken at the instance of DDA on 19.06.2025, but he has no further instructions.

8. It prima facie appears that the impugned order is predicated upon acquisition proceedings which have already been set aside. It is, therefore, directed that no further proceedings will be taken in terms of the impugned order dated 12.07.2025, until the next date of hearing.

9. The respondents are directed to file their affidavits within one week from today. The affidavits be filed by the concerned District Magistrate, GNCTD, and the concerned Director, DDA.

10. Learned counsel for the respondents are requested to communicate this order to the concerned officers.

11. List on 14.08.2025, in the category of “For Admission” matters.

12. A copy of the order be given dasti under the signature of the Court Master.”

2. The respondent No. 1 – Government of National Capital Territory



of Delhi, has now filed an affidavit of the District Magistrate (South), New Delhi. Although the affidavit is not on record, a copy of the same has been handed up in Court and is taken on record. The affidavit states as follows:

“12. That pursuant to the joint survey report dated 25.06.2025 and demolition notice/order dated 12.07.2025, multiple representations were received in this office which were issued to DDA and Land & Building Department informing about the above representations and it was requested from both the departments to check the representations and advise accordingly. No such representation was received from the petitioner.

13. That only after going through the writ petition, the record of the LAC was examined and it was found that there is no updation/entry in the record regarding quashing of the acquisition proceedings in respect of subject land.

14. That after going through the order annexed with the writ petition, it came out that the WP(C) No. 991/1986 had been allowed in terms of the order passed in Balak Ram Gupta Vs Union of India & Ors. 37(1989) DLT 150.

15. That the record also revealed that earlier NOC had been issued in respect of land comprised in Khasra No. 550/4 (0-19), 553/1(2-13), 556/3 (0-18) and 557/6 (0-6) of village Satbari.

16. That in view of the above, demolition programme would be carried out only with respect to the land in respect of which acquisition proceeding has not been quashed or in respect of which acquisition proceeding has been upheld by the Supreme Court.”

3. In view of the above, Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that no further orders are required in this writ petition.

4. The writ petition, alongwith the pending application, is therefore disposed of, binding the respondents to the aforesaid submissions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 14, 2025

SS/KA/