



\$~108

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14222/2025**

**SHAMA KHANAM ASRAR THROUGH GPA HOLDER SH
MOHD RIZWAN QAMAR**Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ayush Dassi and Mr. Divyansh
Malhotra, Advocates.

versus

**DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY THROUGH ITS VICE
CHARIMAN**Respondent

Through: Mr. R.K. Dhawan, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Nisha Dhawan, Mr. V.K. Teng and Mr.
Pawan Kr. Deo, Advocates and also Ms. Shobhana
Takiar, Standing Counsel with Mr. Kuljeet Singh,
Advocate for DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

15.09.2025

CM APPL. 58376/2025

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of

W.P.(C) 14222/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by petitioner seeking following reliefs:

“In view of aforementioned facts and circumstances it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a writ of Mandamus thereby directing respondent herein to demarcate the property/land of the petitioner and also handover the possession of the property /land of the petitioner



to the petitioner after demarcation in terms of sale deed dated 20.1.1988.

Also issue a further Writ of Mandamus thereby directing the respondent herein to mutate the property/ Land of the petitioner in her name in the revenue records as per the sale deed dated 20.1.1988”

4. Mr. Ayush Dassi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that prior to filing of present writ petition, petitioner had filed another writ petition being W.P.(C) 4819/2025 titled as *Shama Khanam Asrar v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi and Ors.* He submits that in the said petition, respondent/DDA had not been impleaded as respondent. However, vide order dated 16.04.2025, this Court disposed of the aforesaid writ petition after noting submissions of learned counsel for Government of NCT of Delhi, who appeared on advance notice, to the effect that the land has already been urbanized, and jurisdiction for the purpose of demarcation and mutation both lie with DDA.

5. He submits that petitioner was also granted liberty to approach DDA by way of a representation. He submits that in view of the liberty so granted by this Court, representation dated 09.05.2025 (Annexure-8) was made by petitioner to respondent/DDA. However, the said representation of petitioner has not been disposed of.

6. Mr. R.K. Dhawan, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/DDA submits that since DDA was not a party in earlier writ petition, i.e., W.P.(C) 4819/2025, it is perhaps for the said reason, representation of petitioner has gone unnoticed.

7. He further contends that it is the case of petitioner herself that



possession of the land which was purchased by petitioner vide registered sale deed 20.01.1988 was never handed over to petitioner by the vendor.

8. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that at this stage, the only concern of petitioner is that representation dated 09.05.2025 made by petitioner be disposed of by the respondent/DDA.

9. In view of the limited prayer articulated by learned counsel for petitioner, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent/DDA to dispose of the representation of petitioner dated 09.05.2025 (Annexure-8) within a period of six weeks by a speaking order. A copy of speaking order shall be communicated to petitioner within a period of two weeks thereafter. Petitioner will also furnish complete copy of the writ petition to the Director (Land Management), DDA.

10. Needless to state that in the event, representation of petitioner is decided against petitioner, he shall be at liberty to approach the Court.

11. The petition is disposed of in above terms.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 15, 2025/jg