



\$~5

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11384/2017**

SMT. KAMLESH DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Neeraj Malhotra, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Kavindra Solanki, Mr.
Nimish Kumar and Mr. Nitin Kumar,
Advocates

versus

D. D. A. AND ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anuj Chaturvedi, Ms. Harshita
Maheshwari and Mr. Pawan Karan
Deo, Advocates for DDA

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
04.03.2025

%

1. After hearing arguments for some time, learned Senior Counsel for petitioner, on instructions, submits that petitioner does not press the present writ petition and seeks liberty to file representation afresh before the Chairman, Delhi Development Authority (DDA) for regularizing the allotment in question.
2. Petitioner is widow of an employee of DDA.
3. After the unfortunate death of her husband, she applied for allotment of a shop on *out-of-turn basis*. It is submitted that for the reason, she could not raise requisite funds for making the entire payment as per the demand letter, her allotment was cancelled. It is submitted that petitioner had, earlier, deposited a sum of Rs. 3,05,160/- on 23.11.2015 (by way of demand draft) which is still lying with DDA. Mr. Malhotra, learned Senior Counsel for

W.P.(C) 11384/2017

1



petitioner submits that petitioner is even ready to make payment as per current market rate. He also submits that the shop in question has not yet been allotted to anyone else and, therefore, in the abovesaid peculiar facts and also considering the fact that it was a compassionate allotment, petitioner, at the moment, is not desirous of pressing the present writ petition with liberty, as aforesaid.

4. It is also submitted that while making such representation, the petitioner would also make reference to some precedents where despite there being huge delay, the allotment has been regularized.

5. Learned counsel for respondent/DDA contends that the petition lacks any substance or merit. He also submits that such request should have been rather made at the time when the petition was filed and this is only a ploy to avoid the possible dismissal of the present writ petition.

6. Be that as it may, in view of the aforesaid statement made by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, the present writ petition is disposed of as not pressed and, simultaneously, liberty, as prayed, is granted. Let representation, if any, be filed within four weeks from today. Let any such representation be considered in accordance with law.

7. Petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MARCH 4, 2025/dr/js