



\$~82

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2611/2026**

SHRI BHAGWAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya, Mr. Akhil Rexwal and
Mr. Vipin Kumar, Advocates.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sameer Vashisht, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Harshita Nathrani,
Mr. Aryaman Vaccher and Ms.
Khusbhoo Mittal, Advocates for
GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **25.02.2026**

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner and Mr. Sameer Vashisht, the learned Standing Counsel, representing the Respondents.
2. This Public Interest Litigation petition raises certain concerns about the consolidation proceedings held in respect of a Village Rawta in the year 2000-2002, wherein, according to the Petitioner, the public passage bearing Khasra No. 37/9, which was commonly known as Rawta-Badsa Road, was removed from the Sizra / Map of the said Village, though it was duly recorded in the earlier consolidation records of the year 1972.
3. It is the submission of the Petitioner that the Road / Public Passage in question has been in existence since the time immemorial and has been in use of the general public for commuting and further, that the Road / Public Passage in question provides a vital inter-State connectivity between the



National Capital Territory of Delhi and the State of Haryana. According to the Petitioner, the Road / Public Passage in question also serves as a direct access route to the National Cancer Institute at AIIMS, Jhajjar.

4. It is not in dispute that the consolidation proceedings of the Village in question were completed in the year 2002 in terms of the provisions contained in the East Punjab Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Act, 1948 (“**Act of 1948**”) read with the Delhi Holdings (Consolidation and Prevention of Fragmentation) Rules, 1959 (“**Rules**”). Under the scheme of the Act of 1948 and the Rules, if anyone has any objection relating to any deficiency in the consolidation proceedings, a complete statutory mechanism is provided under the Act for redressal of the grievances.

5. In the facts of the case, the prayer made for directing a Survey, etc., after completion of the consolidation proceedings way back in the year 2002, in our considered opinion, will be impermissible to be granted.

6. So far as the prayer relating to the rectification and correction of the entries in respect of the Road / Public Passage in question is concerned, on the basis of the consolidation proceedings concluded in the year 2002 the records must have been prepared, which in terms of the provisions of the Delhi Land Revenue Act, 1954 (“**Act of 1954**”), is in the custody of the Deputy Commissioner / Collector. In fact, under the Act of 1954, it is the Deputy Commissioner / Collector, who is the custodian of such records.

7. For the aforesaid reasons, it will be more appropriate for the Petitioner to approach the Deputy Commissioner / Collector concerned for collection of the records or for redressal of any other grievances related to the Road / Public Passage in question. Thus, we dispose of this Petition with a liberty to



the Petitioner to approach the Deputy Commissioner / Collector concerned by way of making a representation / application for redressal of his grievances and if any such representation / application is made, the same shall be considered and decided by the Deputy Commissioner / Collector or any other competent authority under law, with expedition.

8. We make it clear that the decision of the representation / application to be preferred by the Petitioner shall be taken by the competent authority strictly in accordance with law. We also clarify that any observation made by us in this Order shall not be construed as our opinion on the merits of the claim of the Petitioner.

9. The Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

FEBRUARY 25, 2026

ap