



\$~3 to 5

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

+ W.P.(C) 11402/2024 & CM APPL. 47317-47318/2024

PROMILA

.....Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 11421/2024 & CM APPL. 47405-47406/2024

NARENDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

+ W.P.(C) 11446/2024 & CM APPL. 47526-47527/2024

VIJAY KUMAR

.....Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Appearances:

Mr. Rajesh Yadav, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Abhay Gahlot, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Abhishek Wadhwa, Advocate for DDA in item No. 3.

Mr. Abhishek Gupta, Advocate for DDA in item No. 4 and 5.

Mr. Nalin Hingorani, Advocate for L&B in item Nos. 3 and 4.

Ms. Zehra Khan, Ms. Delphina S., Advocates for R-3 in item No. 5.

Mr. Sanjay K. Pathak, SC with Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr. M.S. Akhtar, Advocates for L&B.

Mr. Nishant Gautam, CGSC with Mr. Prithviraj Dey, Advocate for R-1 in item No. 5.

Mr. Deepak Tanwar, Advocate for UoI in item No. 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN



ORDER

18.08.2025

%

1. These three writ petitions concern denial of the petitioners' request for allotment of alternative lands/plots *in lieu* of the acquired land. The petitioners assail a decision of the respondents, apparently taken on 04.10.2019, by which their cases were excluded from consideration.
2. Mr. Rajesh Yadav, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, submits that no such decision/order was communicated to the petitioners. However, reference to the same appears in the file notings which were obtained by the petitioners under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ["RTI Act"], and annexed to the captioned writ petitions (Annexure A-9 in all the writ petitions).
3. One of the grounds cited for rejection of the petitioners' applications is that complete documentation had not been supplied by them at the time of filing of these applications. It is the contention of the petitioners that all requisite documents were, in fact, submitted.
4. At this stage, Mr. Yadav only seeks a direction for consideration of the captioned writ petitions as representations, thereby enabling the respondents to consider the factual aspects and pass requisite consequential orders.
5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.3 – Land and Building Department ["the Department"] submit that they do not, at this stage, have final instructions regarding the supply of documents. They, however, point out that the petitioners approached the respondents under the RTI Act only in the year 2022, despite having filed their applications in 2009. They also submit that a public notice dated 06.09.2011 was



issued by the respondents publishing a seniority list for consideration of the applications, to which the petitioners did not respond.

6. Mr. Yadav submits that the public notice pertained only to applications revived up to the year 2000, whereas the petitioners' applications are admittedly of the year 2009.

7. While the parties join issue as to whether the said public notice covered the petitioners' applications which were made only in the year 2009, I am of the view that, at this stage, these matters do not warrant intervention of the Court. The request of the petitioners to treat the present writ petitions as representations is fair and reasonable, particularly as no final order of denial, or reasons for denial, have been communicated to them.

8. The writ petitions, along with pending applications, are accordingly disposed of with a direction that the writ petitions will be treated as representations, and reasoned orders will be passed within a period of eight weeks, after affording the petitioners an opportunity of hearing.

9. It is made clear that all rights and contentions of the parties, including as to the issue of delay, are left open, and this Court has made no observations thereon. If the Department requires any further documents or clarifications from the petitioners, it is at liberty to call for the same.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

AUGUST 18, 2025/‘Bhupi/sd’/