



\$~61

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

+ W.P.(C) 7883/2026 & CM APPL. 38083/2026

G.D. SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: appearance not given

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Mrinalini Sen SC for DDA with

Ms. Aditi Saxena, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

29.05.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers :-

“a. Issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction in the nature of Mandamus directing the Respondents to consider the Petitioner’s Application and convert the Petitioner’s property bearing Plot No. 61, Pocket No. 26, Block-F, Sector-7, Delhi, from leasehold to freehold, strictly in accordance with the Comprehensive Policy for Levying Misuse Charges dated 05.05.2016, without levying any misuse charges;

b. Issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction in the nature of Certiorari quashing and setting aside the illegal, arbitrary and unsustainable demands of misuse charges raised by the Respondent, including communications dated 27.08.2004 and 22.05.2018, and all other consequential actions arising therefrom;

c. Issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction directing



the Respondents to consider and decide the Petitioner's representations dated 09.01.2019, 11.04.2019, 02.07.2019 and 19.02.2026 in a time-bound manner, in accordance with law and the applicable policy;

d. Issue an appropriate Writ , Order or Direction restraining the Respondents from taking any coercive action, including recovery of alleged misuse charges or denial of conversion, pursuant to the impugned demands, during the pendency of the present writ petition;..."

2. For the reasons stated in the petition issue notice.
3. Ms. Sen, learned standing counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent/DDA.
4. A perusal of the prayers show that the petitioner is challenging the misuse charges raised by the communication dated 27.08.2004 and 22.05.2018.
5. A perusal of the petition shows that no satisfactory explanation has been given by the petitioner for approaching the Court after an inordinate delay of almost 8 years.
6. Even though the principles of limitation are not applicable to the writ petition, however the petitioner has to satisfy the inordinate delay in approaching the Court.
7. In the absence of such satisfactory explanation, I am of the view that the petition is barred by delay and laches and hence, the petition is dismissed.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MAY 29, 2026/sp