



\$~97

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

+ W.P.(C) 6780/2026

M/S RD RETAIL INDIA PVT. LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. V.P. Rana, Mr. Aviral Jain and
Ms. Rut Pawar, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhinav Singh and Mr. Rishabh
Mittal, Advocates for GNCTD.
Mr. Shashi Pratap Shahi, Ms. Shagun
Abharwal, MS. Anamika Tyagi and
Ms. Laqshyaa Saluja Advocates for
R-1/ DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **18.05.2026**

1. Issue notice. Counsel for Respondents mentioned in the appearance above accepts notice.
2. The Petitioner seeks a direction to the Respondents to carry out demarcation and identification of the boundaries of Khasra Nos. 14/16 (4-05) and 14/17 (4-16), situated at Village Hamidpur, Delhi.¹ The case of the Petitioner is that despite repeated representations and notices issued by the revenue authorities fixing dates for demarcation, the exercise has not been completed. According to the Petitioner, although dates for demarcation were fixed by the revenue authorities, the exercise was not undertaken on the

¹ "subject land"



ground that, in view of the order dated 3rd September, 2025 passed by this Court in *Luv Nagpal & Anr. v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors.*,² the demarcation was required to be carried out in coordination with the Delhi Development Authority³ through a third-party agency.

3. It is not in dispute that no notification under Section 507 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 declaring Village Hamidpur to be urbanised has been issued. The only notification pointed out by the Petitioner is the notification dated 18th June, 2013 issued by the Ministry of Urban Development, wherein Village Hamidpur finds mention in the list of villages falling within the green belt where low density residential plots are permissible, being included in Zone P-2.

4. Counsel appearing for DDA submits that the area where the subject land is situated continues to remain rural and, therefore, DDA does not possess authority to undertake the demarcation exercise, which according to him, falls within the domain of the concerned revenue authorities.

5. In *Luv Nagpal*, this Court had directed GNCTD and DDA to carry out the demarcation exercise in coordination and through a third-party agency, in the presence of the petitioners or their representatives, so that the process is not delayed pending adjudication of the jurisdictional issue before the Full Bench in *O. REF. 1/2024* titled *Court on its Own Motion v. NEMO*.

6. Similar directions have also been issued by this Court in other matters including *Chandrakala & Anr. v. Govt. NCT of Delhi*⁴ and *Rajender Singh*

² W.P.(C) 13567/2025

³ “DDA”

⁴ W.P.(C) 5930/2026



& Anr. v. SDM/Revenue Assistant, Mehrauli.⁵

7. In the opinion of the Court, since DDA as well as GNCTD are represented before this Court, and in order to obviate any ambiguity regarding the status of the subject land, the participation of DDA in the demarcation exercise would be necessary. This Court has, in similar circumstances, issued directions requiring the concerned State agencies to act in coordination for carrying out the demarcation exercise.

8. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction that the demarcation exercise in respect of the land described in the prayer clause shall be carried out through a third-party agency, in coordination with GNCTD and DDA, within a period of three months from today. The Petitioner or its representatives shall be associated with the demarcation exercise, and the expenses thereof shall be borne by the Petitioner.

9. It is made clear that the aforesaid directions shall remain subject to any orders passed by the Full Bench in *O. REF. 1/2024*. It is further clarified that the present order is passed without prejudice to the rights and contentions of GNCTD and DDA in the said proceedings.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 18, 2026

nk

⁵ W.P.(C) 14600/2025, decided on 08th October, 2025