



\$~103

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 14333/2025, CM APPL. 58747/2025, 58748/2025
JASDEEP SINGH & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Mr. Sugam Puri and
Ms. Shivani Bardia, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITYRespondent

Through: Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC for DDA
with Mr. Gautam Yadav, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

18.09.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking following relief:

“a. Issue a Writ, Order or Direction to quash and set aside the impugned speaking order dated 04.09.2025 passed by the Respondent.

b. Issue a Writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus/and or other Writ restraining the Respondent (DDA) from unlawfully demolishing the property or taking any coercive steps for the bearing Khasra no. 48/7 stated in the village of Humayunpur, Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi.

c. Direct the respondents to maintain status quo in the Property Bearing Khasra Number 48/7 situated in village Humayunpur, Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi.”

2. The controversy in the present petition is with regard to the exact location of petitioners' property. The contention of the petitioners is that their properties form part of Khasra No.48/7 situated at Krishna Nagar, New Delhi which was not part of acquisition proceedings.

3. On the other hand, the DDA's contention is that the said properties are comprised in Khasra No.48/5 situated at Krishna Nagar, New Delhi



which stood acquired.

4. The controversy articulated in the present petition appears to be a disputed question of fact which can only be resolved by leading evidence and not in the summary proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. At this stage, Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he wishes to withdraw the petition and approach the learned Civil Court. However, he urges the Court that petitioners may be protected for a period of four weeks.

6. In view of the above, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as aforesaid.

7. It is directed that no coercive action be taken against the petitioners for a period of four weeks from today.

8. It is further clarified that no opinion has been expressed by this Court on the merits of the case. The learned Civil Court will consider the prayer for interim relief in a suit proposed to be filed by the petitioners, on its own merits.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 18, 2025/dss