



\$~101

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2151/2026 and CM APPL. 10482/2026**

AJAY NANDA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Sameer Dewan and Mr.Prabhat
Ranjan Tiwari Advocates.

versus

THE LT GOVERNOR OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel Counsel
with Mr. Mr Kartik Sharma,
Advocates for R- GNCTD

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

16.02.2026

%

1. The petitioner claims to be *bona fide* purchaser and in a settled, uninterrupted possession since 1999, of the property bearing No. A-383-D, Janta Flat, 3rd Floor, New Ranjeet Nagar, New Delhi. The said property was originally allotted in the year 1986 to one Abdul Sattar under the Government rehabilitation scheme by Delhi Urban Shelter Improvement Board (DUSIB) i.e. respondent no.2 herein.
2. The petitioner submits that the original allotment was made after official verification, possession was handed over by DUSIB, and the property was thereafter, lawfully transferred, culminating in purchase by the petitioner for valuable consideration. According to the petitioner, the petitioner is the second purchaser after the original allotment.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has



applied for freehold conversion in the year 2001. The application was process and the part payment was accepted by DUSIB in the year 2007. He, however, contends that in the year 2022, the allotment itself was cancelled. The petitioner then pursued the remedy by filing a civil suit, whereby, injunction was granted for a time being. After evidence etc., the said civil suit came to be withdrawn. The petitioner then, approached the Lieutenant Governor (LG), who *vide* the impugned order has dismissed the petitioner's appeal.

4. It is, thus, seen that as of now, the petitioner could not get any relief either in the civil suit or in the appeal before the LG.

5. Mr. Sameer Dewan, learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the relief *qua* declaration of the property in question from leasehold to freehold. He, however, submits that on account of the decision taken by the DUSIB, he apprehends coercive action against the petitioner for sealing and vacation of the suit property. He has shown various documents to indicate that the petitioner is in possession of the property in question since 1999.

6. The Court, at this stage, is not adjudicating the title of the petitioner over the suit property. However, in any case, if the respondent- DUSIB intends to evict the petitioner or take any coercive steps against the petitioner, the same shall be done in accordance with law.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.

8. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 16, 2026

Nc/ mj