



\$~3

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

+ W.P.(C) 15746/2023

MEHRUDDIN ANSARI & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Archit Arora, Adv.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, SC with
Ms. Harshita Rai & Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Advs. Mr. Vijendra
from DDA.

Mr. Ashish Batra, SPC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

ORDER

% **13.05.2025**

CM APPL. 24437/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The applications shall stand disposed of.

REVIEW PET. 224/2025 (For review of the order dated 03.02.2025)

3. The applicants/petitioners have preferred this petition under Section 114 read with Order XLVII read with Section 151 of the Code of the Civil Procedure, 1908 ['CPC'], seeking review of the judgment dated 03.02.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No. 15746/2023.
4. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1/DDA is present on advance notice.
5. Having heard the learned counsels for the parties and on perusal of the record, this Court finds that the present review application is



bereft of any merits.

6. Suffice to state that the petitioners filed the W.P.(C) No. 15746/2023 primarily seeking protection of their long occupation and possession of their respective properties in an unauthorized colony, viz., Jogabai Extension, claiming that the same was enlisted for regularization and for conferring ownership rights to the residents including the petitioners under the PM-Uday Scheme; and *inter-alia* sought quashing of notice dated 27.10.2023 issued by the respondent No.1 envisaging action on their part for removal of unauthorized constructions existing on the subject land.

7. This Court *vide* impugned judgment dated 03.02.2025 dismissed the W.P.(C) No. 15746/2023 finding that the petitioners woefully failed to demonstrate any legal right, title or interest over the properties in question, so much so that they were not even able to give a precise location of their properties. It was observed by this Court that the petitioners were falsely raising a claim to project themselves as the residents within the boundaries of an unauthorized colony, i.e., Jogabai Extension, which was belied from the mapping of the entire area done by the DDA; and it was also brought to the fore that the unauthorized encroachment and construction by the petitioners was falling in Zone 'O', i.e. Yamuna Flood Plains.

8. In the present application seeking review, it is stated that the impugned judgment suffers from factual errors, which are apparent on the face of the record inasmuch as the location of the properties of the petitioners which has been indicated in a tabular form in paragraph (03) of the judgment is different from the addresses of the parties mentioned in the Memo of Parties; and that the image Nos. I and II which were placed on the record by the respondent No.1/DDA alongwith their



affidavit let this Court to wrongly assume that the properties in question are situated more than 2 kms from the site of the demolition, and thereby portraying a factually wrong disposition.

9. I am afraid that no cogent and tangible reasons are advanced by the petitioners to seek review of the impugned judgment. There appears to be no error apparent on the face of the record so as to warrant any review.

10. At the cost of repetition, the petitioners have miserably failed to show the physical location of their properties. The petitioners appear to be those persons who are perennially trying to encroach upon public land by re-settling on the subject land each time after a demolition drive is undertaken by the DDA and other authorities.

11. In view of the foregoing discussion, the review petition is dismissed.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.

MAY 13, 2025/sp/ES