



\$~6

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

+ **FAO 237/2019, CM APPL. 27597/2019**

YUDHVIR SINGH & ORS

.....Appellants

Through: None.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manika Tripathi, SC for DDA
with Mr. Ashutosh Kaushik,
Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

06.01.2026

%

1. None appears for the appellants.
2. It is noted that even on the last date of hearing, the appellants remained unrepresented.
3. Ms. Manika Tripathi, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the DDA submits that even otherwise, the present appeal has become infructuous, as the appellants, who were the plaintiffs before the learned Trial Court, had filed a suit for permanent injunction premising their relief on the decision of Division Bench of this Court dated 17.07.2017 passed in **W.P.(C) No.2727/2015** titled 'Yudhvir Singh & Ors. v. Union of India & Anr.' She stated that in the aforesaid decision, the writ petition filed by the appellants was allowed, observing that the award passed in the context of suit land is deemed to have lapsed by virtue of Section 24 (2) of the Land Acquisition Act. She further states that the said decision came to be assailed before the Supreme Court by way of an SLP vide Diary No. 10284/2022. It



is stated that the said SLP along with batch of petitions came to be disposed of by the Supreme Court vide order dated 17.05.2024. She submits that the case of the appellants falls under the List 'E.2' of the said decision. She submits that since the acquisition proceedings qua suit land were upheld, the appellants have no claim over the suit land.

4. It is noted that the present appeal has been preferred by the appellants assailing the order dated 22.05.2019 passed by the learned Trial Court whereby the application filed on behalf of the appellants/plaintiffs under Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 CPC seeking an injunction against the defendants from interfering with peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property was dismissed and the interim order was vacated.

5. Keeping in view the continued absence of the appellants as well as the aforesaid decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court whereby the acquisition proceedings were upheld, I do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order.

6. The present appeal, along with any pending applications is accordingly dismissed.

7. No order as to costs.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

JANUARY 6, 2026/rd