



\$~2

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

+ W.P.(C) 1914/2026

JAGAN SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: *Appearance not given.*

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jivesh Kumar Tiwari, CGSC with
Ms. Nandini Aggarwal and
Ms. Himani Bhardwaj, Advocates for
R-1.

Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC for DDA
with Mr. Aakash Mohar, Advocate.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with
Mr. K.K. Kiran Pathak, Mr. Sunil
Kumar Jha, Mr. M.S. Akhtar and
Ms. Joohu Kumari, Advocates for R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

17.02.2026

%

1. The Petitioner urges that his land was acquired under Award dated 18th December, 1992. It is asserted that the land falling in Khasra No. 409 min measuring 11 bighas in Village Jasola, Delhi is presently of no use to the DDA and that there are no future prospects of its utilisation for channelization of the River Yamuna.

2. In this background, the Petitioner has approached this Court seeking a writ of mandamus directing the Respondents to expedite disposal of his representations dated 13th December, 2023, 7th November, 2024 and 19th December, 2025 purportedly filed under Section 48 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and Section 93 of the 2013 Act for withdrawal/denotification of



the acquisition.

3. Counsel for the Respondents, on instructions, submit that the Petitioner has no surviving cause of action. It is contended that the Award was passed in the year 1992 and the acquisition proceedings have long attained finality. They further submit that the Petitioner cannot, after decades, seek to create a cause of action by filing representations and thereafter seek a mandamus for their consideration. The Respondents also dispute the Petitioner's assertion that the land has no present or future utilisation.

4. Although the prayer, as worded, appears innocuous and seeks only a decision on representations, the Court is mindful that the Award in question was passed more than three decades ago and the acquisition proceedings have already been the subject matter of earlier litigation between the parties. In such circumstances, directing consideration of representations seeking withdrawal from acquisition would effectively permit reopening of concluded proceedings.

5. If the Petitioner has any subsisting claim arising under the land acquisition laws, the same must be pursued in accordance with law. A writ of mandamus cannot be issued merely to require consideration of belated representations so as to generate a fresh cause of action.

6. The Court therefore finds no basis to issue the directions sought.

7. The present petition is accordingly disposed of without examining the merits of the Petitioner's claims.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2026/nk