$~17

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11858/2025

MRS RANI JAIN & ORS. .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ashish Mohan, Senior Advocate, with Mr. Vibhor Verdhan and Mr Anant Beniwal, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ORS. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Senior Advocate & Ms. Shobhana Takiar, Standing Counsel with Mr. Kuljeet Singh, Mr. Govind Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar & Ms. Anamika, Advocates for DDA.

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Standing Counsel with Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr. M.S. Akhtar, Advocates with Mr. Raul Saini, LAC (South).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

O R D E R

% **15.09.2025**

1. By way of this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, the petitioners seek rectification of revenue records with respect to land admeasuring *1 Bigha 6 Biswas forming part of Khasra No. 567/2 min and the entirety of Khasra No. 570/2 in Green Meadows, Village Satbari, Mehrauli, New Delhi* ["subject land"].

2. Mr. Ashish Mohan, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, submits that the revenue records reflect that the subject land is Government land, despite the fact that proceedings for acquisition of the land were set aside/declared lapsed by orders of this Court and the Supreme Court. He points out that the acquisition proceedings were initiated in the year 1980, but this Court quashed the proceedings by order dated 19.09.1990 in C.W.P. 990/1986. By judgment dated 15.12.2014, in a subsequent writ petition [W.P.(C) 4579/2014], it was also declared, that the acquisition proceedings, if any, had lapsed. The said judgment was challenged before the Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 8534/2016, which was dismissed *vide* order dated 31.08.2016. Although respondent No. 1-Delhi Development Authority ["DDA"] was granted liberty to initiate fresh acquisition proceedings within a period of one year, no such proceedings were initiated. In such circumstances, Mr. Mohan submits that the land revenue records ought to be rectified to reflect the ownership of the petitioners, whose predecessor-in-interest purchased the subject land by virtue of a registered sale deed executed in the year 1980.

3. DDA has filed affidavit in terms of directions of this Court dated 07.08.2025 and 03.09.2025. The facts relating to the litigation culminating in the Supreme Court's order dated 31.08.2016 have been narrated in the affidavit. It is also stated that, the appeal filed by the DDA and SLP (C) No. 11298/2016 filed by the Land Acquisition Collector against the judgement dated 15.12.2014 were dismissed by the Supreme Court on 31.08.2016 and 08.09.2016, respectively, and a Review Petition (Dy. No. 32564/2021) against order dated 31.08.2016 was also dismissed

on 02.03.2022. DDA has nevertheless preferred a further miscellaneous application before the Supreme Court, registered under Diary No. 52103/2025, on 11.09.2025.

4. The affidavit dated 13.09.2025 filed by GNCTD is not on record. A copy has been handed up to the Court and is taken on record. It essentially follows the same position as taken in DDA's affidavit.

5. Mr. Sanjay Poddar, learned Senior Counsel for DDA, and Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, learned counsel for GNCTD, clarify that, subject to the decision of the Supreme Court in the miscellaneous application filed by DDA, at this time, neither DDA nor GNCTD assert any right to the subject land. The aforesaid statements are taken on record.

6. The difficulty with rectification, however, arises from an independent circumstance, which is that the village in question has been urbanised by a notification dated 25.09.2020 under Section 507(a) of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957. It is the contention of the respondents that no rectification of the revenue records can be undertaken by the revenue authorities, in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Mohinder Singh (deceased) through LRs & Anr. v. Narain Singh & Ors*. [(2023) 19 SCC 535] [hereinafter, "*Mohinder Singh*"]. It may be noted that the effect of the judgment in *Mohinder Singh, inter alia,* on the jurisdiction to carry out mutation of revenue records, is presently pending consideration before the Full Bench of this Court in Original Reference 01/2024. The rectification of the revenue records will therefore have to await the decision of the Full Bench.

7. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of by recording the submission of DDA and GNCTD that they do not, at present, assert any

right over the subject land, without prejudice to the contentions of DDA in M.A. (Diary No. 52103/2025) before the Supreme Court. The rectification of the revenue records, however, will be carried out in terms of the decision of the Full Bench in Original Reference No. 01/2024.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

SEPTEMBER 15, 2025
'pv/JM'/