



\$~68

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 1623/2026 & CM APPL. 7887/2026**
MR. DHARAM VIR SINGH GAHLOT AND ANRPetitioners

Through: Mr. F.A. Khan, Mr. Tabish Kaman
and Mohd. Yousaf Ali, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Himanshu Bidhuri, SPC with Mr.
Kushagra Malik and Ms. Ankita
Bidhuri, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Hemant Singh, Ms. Urvashi Jain,
Mr. Attrey Gupta and Mr. Aman
Bidhuri, Advocates for R-3 (MCD).
Counsel for R-8. (*Appearance not
given*).
Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi, Advocate for
GNCTD.
Mr. Manish Srivastava, Mr. Moksh
Arora and Mr. Santosh Bamdurg,
Advocates for R-11.
Mr. Tushar Sannu and Mr. Parvin
Bansal, Advocates for R-2 (DDA).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

05.02.2026

1. This petition has been filed by the Petitioners, who claim ownership and lawful possession of agricultural land situated in the revenue estate of Village Dindarpur, Tehsil Najafgarh, New Delhi - 110043, as detailed in the writ petition. The Petitioners seek various directions, *inter alia*, for demarcation of the said land, mutation of their names in the revenue records,



and ancillary reliefs.

2. The ownership claimed by the Petitioners is founded upon registered sale deeds, copies whereof are attached with the petition. It is the Petitioners' case that upon acquisition of title, they approached the concerned revenue authorities for demarcation of the subject land. An application to this effect was moved before the concerned Sub-Divisional Magistrate. However, the Tehsildar (Kapashera), by a communication dated 09th March, 2024, declined to carry out the demarcation, observing that Village Dindarpur stands notified as an organised/urbanised village *vide* notification dated 16th May, 2017 issued under Section 507 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Mohinder Singh (dead) through LRs v. Narain Singh***, Civil Appeal No. 3828 of 2017, to observe that once a village is urbanised, the provisions of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954 cease to apply and, consequently, the revenue authorities lack jurisdiction to carry out demarcation.

3. In light of the aforesaid communication, the Petitioners assert that the responsibility for demarcation would now vest with the land-owning or notifying agency concerned with urbanised land, which according to them is the Delhi Development Authority. The Petitioners further complain of inaction on the part of the revenue authorities in processing their application for mutation of the subject property, despite the same having been filed on 15th May, 2023.

4. In the above background, the Petitioners seek the following reliefs:

- “a) *Direct the Respondents to carry out demarcation and site verification of the said property to record the Petitioner's lawful possession;*



- b) *Issue a writ of mandamus directing Respondent Nos. 7, 8 and 9 (District Magistrate (South-West), Sub-Divisional Magistrate (Kapashera) and Tehsildar (Kapashera)) to forthwith process and complete the mutation of the Petitioner's property situated in Village Dindarpur, Tehsil Najafgarh, New Delhi- 110043, in the name of the Petitioner and his co-owner;*
- c) *Direct Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 (Delhi Development Authority and Municipal Corporation of Delhi) to clarify jurisdictional applicability over the said land, being part of an urbanized village; and to incorporate the same in their official records in coordination with the Revenue Authorities;*
- d) *Direct Respondent No. 11 (BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.) to grant an electricity connection in the name of the Petitioner upon verification of the sale deed and possession, without insisting upon NOC or pending mutation, especially when such delay is attributable to inter-departmental inaction;”*

5. As regards prayer (a) concerning demarcation, it is noted that the issue as to which authority or agency is competent to carry out demarcation of land in an urbanised village is presently pending consideration before a Larger Bench of this Court in O.REF. 1/2024, titled ***Court on its Own Motion v. NEMO***. In view thereof, this Court is not inclined to issue any direction for demarcation at this stage as the issue is *sub judice*. The Petitioners shall, subject to the outcome of the aforesaid reference, be at liberty to revive their request for demarcation before the authority or agency that may be designated by the Larger Bench.

6. Insofar as prayer (b) relating to mutation is concerned, counsel appearing for Respondent No. 8, on instructions, submits that the concerned Sub-Divisional Magistrate is the custodian of the original revenue records and that the process of mutation falls within the jurisdiction of the said authority. Accordingly, it is directed that the concerned SDM shall take necessary steps in accordance with law for processing the Petitioners' mutation application.



7. Prayer (c) seeks directions to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to record the names of the Petitioners in their official records. Once land stands urbanised, the recording of ownership details by the land-owning or municipal agencies becomes necessary. Accordingly, Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 shall coordinate with each other, as well as with the revenue authorities, and take appropriate steps for incorporating the names of the Petitioners in their respective records, in accordance with law.
8. Prayer (d) pertains to grant of an electricity connection by Respondent No. 11, BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. Counsel appearing for the said Respondent points out that the Petitioners have not, as yet, applied for an electricity connection. In view thereof, no mandamus can be issued at this stage. However, if the Petitioners submit an appropriate application seeking electricity connection, the same shall be processed by Respondent No. 11 on its own merits, in accordance with law.
9. With the above directions, the present petition is disposed of. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 5, 2026/as