



\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 14177/2025**

MUNNI LAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kundan Chandrvanshi,
Mr. Aslam Khan, Mr. Ankur Yadav,
Mr. Anuj Goswami, Advs.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. G. S. Oberoi, ASC DDA
alongwith Mr. Ankur Sharma, Adv.,
Ms. Shaifali Jain, Adv., Mr. J. S.
Oberoi, Adv., For Respondent DDA
(thru VC)
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Standing
Counsel for R-2 with Ms. K K Kiran
Pathak, Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr.
M.S. Akhtar, Advs for R-1, 2 & 4

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

14.10.2025

1. Heard.
2. Prayer in the writ petition is for issuance of directions to respondent No. 3, Delhi Development Authority ('**DDA**') to forthwith hand over physical possession of residential plot within time-bound manner, complete in all respects with proper demarcation, boundary marks and possession letter, pursuant to the scheme of *Large Scale Acquisition, Development & Disposal of Land in Delhi, 1961*, pursuant to the acquisition of 35 Bighas 5 Biswas of land in *Village Mandoli, Delhi*, vide Award No.1396 dated 22nd September 1962.



3. In the alternative, petitioner has sought issuance of directions to respondent to pay monetary compensation equivalent to the current market rate of 400 sq. yds. of residential plot in *East Delhi*, approximately *Rs. 7 crores*, along with interest at rate of *12% per annum* from the date of allotment of petitioner to the said land in 1987 until realization and a solatium of *Rs.10 lakhs* for mental agony, financial hardship, and loss of opportunity caused by the respondents in causing inordinate delay in handing over the alternate land.

4. Petitioner has also sought exemplary costs to be recovered to the tune of *Rs. 5 lakhs* from respondent.

5. The facts necessary for deciding the present petition are as under:

i. It appears that one *Sh. Baru*, son of *Sh. Roop Chand* was owner of the following lands:

Khasra No.	Area (big.bis.)	Kind of land
1356	3-3	Rosli
1357	2-17	Rosli, Ghairmukin 2-15 well 0-2
1358	3-3	Rosli
1360	5-5	Rosli
1361	3-0	Chahi
1362	3-0	Chahi
1363	3-18	Chahi
1365	2-14	Rosli
1366	1-4	Rosli
1367	1-7	Rosli
1384	1-13	Rosli



1811/1385	4-1	Rosli
Total	35-5	

Total area 35 *Bighas* 5 *Biswas*, which was subjected to acquisition through Award dated 22nd September 1962.

ii. Said *Sh. Baru* expired on 10th December 1978, and as such his son, namely *Sh. Sohan Lal* started pursuing the issue of allotment of alternate plot. *Sh. Sohan Lal* passed away on 17th July 2002.

iii. Petitioner, being son of Late *Sh. Sohan Lal*, and grandson of Late *Sh. Baru* has approached this Court seeking allotment of land or else compensation, as prayed in the prayer clause.

6. This Court, having regard to the delay caused, raised a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the petition, as, in our view, the petition suffers from *delay and laches*. The Award in the case in hand was delivered on 22nd September 1962, whereas the petition seeking allotment of plot or, in alternative, compensation was moved only in 2025.

7. Counsel for petitioner urges that after the death of *Sh. Baru*, petitioner's grandfather, it was *Sh. Sohan Lal*, father of petitioner, who pursued the issue with respondent.

8. Counsel for petitioner invited our attention to various communications exchanged *inter se* late father of petitioner and respondent no.3/DDA and LAC. According to him, the last communication exchanged between the parties was in 1988, when father of petitioner submitted an affidavit and was called by the respondent to process the request for allotment of alternate land.

9. According to counsel for petitioner, the process of allotment of alternate plot is a continuous one and, as such, it cannot be said that claim of petitioner is barred by limitation or that he has approached this Court after



delay and laches.

10. Our attention is also invited to the fact that respondent never rejected claim of petitioner in matter of allotment alternate plot or that of compensation. It is claimed that since the scheme continues, there is continuous cause of action and that being so, petitioner is entitled to allotment alternate plot.

11. We have considered the said contention.

12. It appears that post death of grandfather of petitioner, no doubt, it was indeed the father of petitioner who corresponded with respondents. From the record, it is sought to be established that the last communication was of 5th October 1988, when the father of petitioner submitted an affidavit to process his application for allotment of alternate plot.

13. The father of petitioner, namely *Sh. Sohan Lal* expired on 17th July 2002. From the date of submission of affidavit on 5th October 1988 till his death on 17th July 2002, *Sh. Sohan Lal*, deceased father of petitioner, never pursued the issue before the authority or approached this Court seeking directions to respondent for allotment of the plot or for compensation, as prayed in the petition.

14. Even after the death of petitioner's father, *Sh. Sohan Lal*, on 17th July 2002, it is only in 2025, petitioner moved a representation thereby claiming allotment of plot, i.e. on 24th July 2025.

15. Merely because petitioner has made a representation in July 2025, that by itself will not bring the claim of petitioner within the limitation.

16. Even if scheme is still in continuation, the fact remains that petitioner or his deceased father or the grandfather was duty bound to pursue their claim with respondent authorities for allotment of land.

17. In such an eventuality, this Court is of the view that petitioner has



approached this Court after much *delay and laches* without explaining the delay.

18. Since the petition hopelessly suffers from *delay and laches*, we deem it appropriate to dismiss the same.

19. Petition is accordingly dismissed.

20. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, J

ANISH DAYAL, J

OCTOBER 14, 2025/sm