



\$~33

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11865/2019, CM APPL. 48624/2019**

**SUBHDRA DEVI & ORS**

.....Petitioners

Through: None.

versus

**GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH ITS CHIEF SECRETARY  
& ORS**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhana Takiar, SC with  
Mr. Kuljeet Singh and Mr. Prateek  
Dhir, Advocates for DDA.  
Mr. Siddharth Panda, Mr. Ritank  
Kumar and Mr. Anil Kumar,  
Advocates for R-2.  
Mr. Shashi Pratap Singh and  
Ms. Shagun Sabharwal, Advocates  
for R-1.  
Ms. Mrinalini Sen, SC with  
Ms. Kritika Gupta, Advocate for  
DDA.

**CORAM:  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER**

**27.01.2026**

%

1. There is no appearance on behalf of Petitioners. Nonetheless, with the assistance rendered by the government counsels, the Court has perused the record.
2. The Petitioners claim ownership of land bearing Khasra No. 92 (4-0), situated in the revenue estate of Village Haiderpur, Delhi. The said land was the subject matter of acquisition proceedings initiated by a notification dated



24<sup>th</sup> October, 1961 issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894,<sup>1</sup> followed by a declaration dated 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1966 under Section 6 of the 1894 Act. The acquisition proceedings culminated in an Award dated 18<sup>th</sup> July, 1980, pursuant to which the land vested in Respondent No. 3.

3. The Petitioners challenged the aforesaid acquisition proceedings by filing W.P.(C) No. 8743/2014, titled ***Bishan Singh & Ors. v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors.***, invoking Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.<sup>2</sup> By order dated 9<sup>th</sup> February, 2015, this Court declared that the acquisition proceedings initiated under the 1894 Act in respect of the subject land were deemed to have lapsed.

4. The Delhi Development Authority<sup>3</sup> preferred Civil Appeal No. 8369/2016 before the Supreme Court, which came to be dismissed. However, liberty was granted to the DDA to take recourse under the provisions of the 2013 Act, within a period of one year.

5. Since no steps were taken by the Respondents to correct the revenue records despite representations made by the Petitioners, the present writ petition was filed seeking, *inter alia*, the following reliefs:

- “a) A direction, order or writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ thereby directing the Respondents to release the land and Re-Enter the name of the lawful owners i.e. Petitioners in the revenue record pertaining to land measuring 01 bigha and 07 Biswas of the land comprised in Khasra No.92 Min. Village Haiderpur, Delhi,*
- b) Award the costs of present proceedings in favour of Petitioners and against the Respondent and;”*

6. Subsequently, on an application being M.A. D.No. 411/2023 filed by

---

<sup>1</sup> “the 1894 Act”

<sup>2</sup> “the 2013 Act”



the DDA in *Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.*, the judgment dated 9<sup>th</sup> February, 2015 passed in W.P.(C) No. 8743/2014 was set aside, and the matter was remanded to this Court for fresh consideration. Pursuant thereto, W.P.(C) No. 8743/2014 has been restored to the file of this Court and is presently listed for hearing on 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2026.

7. In view of the aforesaid developments, the very premise on which the Petitioners seek re-entry of their names in the revenue records does not survive for consideration at this stage

8. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of, with liberty to the Petitioners to avail of appropriate remedies in accordance with law, subject to the outcome of W.P.(C) No. 8743/2014.

**SANJEEV NARULA, J**

**JANUARY 27, 2026**

*nk*