



\$~67 & 69

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14539/2025**

M/S SUKH SANSAR HOUSING PVT. LTD.Petitioner

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 14597/2025**

M/S SOLACE HOUSING AND
CONSTRUCTION PVT. LTD.Petitioner

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents

Appearance:- Ms. Archna Yadav, Mr. Pitamber Yadav, Mr. Vinay Yadav, Mr. Sanjay Kumar Yadav, Mr. Sanchit Gupta & Mr. Ashmeet Singh, Advocates for Petitioner in Item Nos. 67 & 69.
Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi & Ms. Ananya Sanjiv Saraogi, Advocates for GNCTD in Item Nos. 67 & 69.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **19.09.2025**

CM APPL. 59663/2025 (exemption) in W.P.(C) 14539/2025

CM APPL. 59859/2025 (exemption) in W.P.(C) 14597/2025

Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 14539/2025 & W.P.(C) 14597/2025

1. Issue notice. Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent – Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi [“GNCTD”].



2. The petitioners seek a direction upon respondent No. 2 – Revenue Assistant / Sub-Divisional Magistrate [“SDM”], to drop the proceedings initiated under Section 81 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 [“DLR Act”], in respect of land bearing *Khasra Nos. 774/2, 787/2, 764/4, 765/4, 773/1 and 788/1 of the revenue estate of Village Gadaipur, Mehrauli* in W.P.(C) 14539/2025, and land bearing *Khasra Nos. 774/1, 785/2, 786/2, 787/1, 764/3 and 775/2/2 of the revenue estate of Village Gadaipur, Mehrauli* in W.P.(C) 14597/2025.

3. The petitioners contend that the proceedings before the Revenue Assistant are no longer maintainable in view of the urbanisation of the village in question by notification dated 20.11.2019 issued under Section 507(a) of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957. On this basis, they have filed applications before the Revenue Assistant seeking closure of the said proceedings. The petitioners had also earlier approached this Court, which directed disposal of their applications.

4. It is stated in the writ petitions that, by orders dated 21.07.2025, the Revenue Assistant recorded that the proceedings should be closed in view of the urbanisation of the village in question. However, the respondent (petitioner herein) was directed to produce precedents other than the Supreme Court’s judgment in *Mohinder Singh v. Narain Singh* [(2023) 19 SCC 535], which dealt with the imposition of Section 81 of the DLR Act, prior to the urbanisation.

5. The petitioners state that they subsequently filed a compilation of judgments in support of their applications. The matter was thereafter listed for arguments on 11.08.2025, and has now been adjourned to 26.09.2025. Although the order dated 11.08.2025 has not been placed on



record, the writ petitions aver that the Revenue Assistant was dissatisfied with the judgments relied upon by the petitioners herein, and accordingly listed the matter for further arguments on 26.09.2025. Mr. Joshi, on instructions, submits that the issue of jurisdiction has not yet been finally decided, and remains under consideration before the Revenue Assistant.

6. In these circumstances, I am of the view that it is not necessary to entertain the writ petitions at this stage. As, according to the respondents, the issue of jurisdiction remains pending consideration before the Revenue Assistant, and is to be decided in accordance with law, I am of the view that the appropriate course is to direct the Revenue Assistant to first decide the question of jurisdiction. The Revenue Assistant is directed to pass a reasoned order on this aspect within a period of four weeks from today, and it will be open to the petitioners to take recourse to appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

7. In the event, the issue has already been decided by order dated 11.08.2025, as contended by the petitioners, copies of the said order be served upon the petitioners and, further proceedings will remain deferred for a period of four weeks thereafter, to enable the petitioners to avail appropriate remedies against the said order.

8. The writ petitions are disposed of with these directions. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the matters.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

SEPTEMBER 19, 2025

'pv/sd'/'