



\$~23

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 13133/2024, CM APPL. 54902/2024, CM APPL. 808/2025**
CM APPL. 24294/2025, CM APPL. 27438/2025
L. MANI RAM KUMAR AND SONS & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sahil Sharma & Mr. Sarthak
Srivastava, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY THROUGH VICE
CHAIRMANRespondent

Through: Mr. Abhishek Wadhwa, Adv. for R-1/
DDA.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
09.04.2026

%

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

“a) To issue a writ of Certiorari or any other writ, order or direction in the nature thereof, quashing the order/ Letter dated 08.08.2024 passed by the Respondent;

b) To issue a writ of Mandamus or any other writ, order or direction in the nature thereof, issuing necessary direction to the Respondent to adjudicate and decide the representation dated 16.05.2024 written by the Petitioners to the Respondent for the execution of a Rectification Deed/ Registration deed of Conveyance deed dated 16.09.2014...”



2. Mr. Sahil Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner restricts his arguments only to a limited perspective, i.e. to quash letter/order dated 08.08.2024.
3. He states that in the present case a registered conveyance deed was executed in favour of the petitioner on 16.09.2014. On averments of the said conveyance deed having been executed by fraudulent documents, the DDA passed impugned order dated 08.08.2024, which reads as under:-



46

**DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
COMMERCIAL LAND BRANCH
Room No. A-116, A-Block, First Floor, VikasSadan, INA, New Delhi-23**

No. F.SM(1150)69/CL/973

Dated:- 8/8/24

To

Sh. Hans Raj Kumar & Sh. Basant Lal Kumar, both partners of M/s
Mani Ram Kumar & Sons, R/o B-179, Derawal Nagar, Delhi.

Sub:-Cancellation of Conveyance Deed for plot No.53, Block-C, NewSubzi Mandi, Azadpur, Delhi

Sir/Madam,

This is to inform that the Competent Authority has decided to cancel the Conveyance Deed in respect of Plot No.53, Block-C, NSM Azadpur, Delhi executed on 16.9.2014. This decision has been made following the discovery that this Deed was obtained through misrepresentation, specifically:

(i) The said Conveyance deed was secured using a forged and fabricated Power of Attorney and other documents purportedly executed by Sh. Gokal Chand, proprietor of M/s Gokal Chand Sons & Co. on 4.9.1986.

(ii) The actual transaction of the property was conducted by Ms.Mithilesh Shah, wife of the late Sh. Gokal Chand through a GPA and ATS executed on 4.9.1986.

2. Pursuant to the power conferred upon the Vendor under clause 4 of the Conveyance Deed date 16.09.2014, the Competent Authority has determined the said Conveyance Deed dated 16.09.2014.

3. Accordingly, the vendees(You) are directed to execute the Cancellation Deed in respect of the above plot and submit the original Conveyance Deed dated 16.09.2014 within 30 days from the date of this notice.

4. Failure to comply with this directive, DDA will have no option but to file a suit u/s 31 of Special Relief Act, 1963 in appropriate Court to effect the cancellation of the Conveyance Deed cancelled.

5. This issues with the approval of competent authority.

Dy. Director (CL)

Copy to:

1. Sub-Registrar (I), Kashmere Gate, Old Court Complex, New Delhi-110006; with a request to make the necessary entry in his record and not execute / consider any of the documents in respect of above said property without further communication from this office.
2. PS to VC, DDA; for kind information of latter.
3. Ps. to Ld. CLA, DDA
4. Director (Vig.), DDA; for kind information.
5. Deputy Director (Survey)/LD with a request to paste the letter at site and provide the photographs having newspaper of that day.
6. Superintendent Engineer, Building, HQ, NDMC, Civic Centre, New Delhi; for information and necessary action.

Dy. Director (CL)



4. Hence the present petition.
5. Mr. Wadhwa, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no. 1 states that one Ms. Rushali Khera had filed W.P. (Crl) 1771/ 2022 and this Court on 03.03.2023 directed as under:-

“15. The Hon’ble High Court has disposed off the W.P. (Crl) 1771/22 on 03.03.2023 with the following direction:-

“15. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed off with a direction to Respondent No. 4/ DDA to decide the representation dated 28.01.2022 by passing a speaking order, within a period of four weeks.”

6. It is pursuant to the said direction that the impugned order has been passed.
7. Mr. Deepak Vashisht, learned counsel appears for Ms. Rushali Khera and states that the DDA has filed a civil suit under Section 31 of the Specific Relief Act, 1963 hence the present petition has become infructuous.
8. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.
9. In the present case, the averments made by Ms. Khera regarding the conveyance deed having been executed by use of fraudulent documents and in a malafide and illegal manner is for a civil court to adjudicate. The Civil suit in this regard being **CS (COMM.) 582/2025** titled **DDA v. L Mani Ram Kumar & Sons** is already pending.
10. Reliance has been placed on **Satya Pal Anand v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors., (2016) 10 SCC 767** which deals with the law with regard to cancellation of a registered deed. Relevant paragraphs read as under:-

“40.At the same time, once the document is



registered, it is not open to the Registering Officer to cancel that registration even if his attention is invited to some irregularity committed during the registration of the document. The aggrieved party can challenge the registration and validity of the document before the Civil Court. The majority view of the Full Bench was that if a person is aggrieved by the Extinguishment Deed or its registration, his remedy is to seek appropriate relief in the Civil Court and a Writ Petition is not the proper remedy.

41. Section 35 of the Act does not confer a quasi-judicial power on the Registering Authority. The Registering Officer is expected to reassure that the document to be registered is accompanied by supporting documents. He is not expected to evaluate the title or irregularity in the document as such. The examination to be done by him is incidental, to ascertain that there is no violation of provisions of the Act of 1908. In the case of Park View Enterprises (supra) it has been observed that the function of the Registering Officer is purely administrative and not quasi-judicial. He cannot decide as to whether a document presented for registration is executed by person having title, as mentioned in the instrument. We agree with that exposition.”

(emphasis added)

11. Similarly, reliance has been placed on paragraph 21 of **Raj Rani v.**



DDA & Ors, 2024:DHC:7399, which reads as under:-

“21. I have given my thoughtful consideration to the submissions advanced by learned counsels for the rival parties at the Bar and I have also perused the record. At the outset, this court finds that the impugned letter/notice (s) dated 24.09.2007 & 04.06.2008 followed by subsequent decision vide letter dated 13.08.2010 by the DDA, thereby intimating cancellation of the Conveyance Deed dated 13.04.2004 cannot be sustained in law.”

12. In view of the above, since it is the settled law that a registered conveyance deed can only be cancelled by a Civil Court in a suit seeking cancellation, the impugned order of 08.08.2024 cannot be sustained and is consequently set aside. The Court has not examined the allegations of fraud made by Ms. Khera or the DDA and the same are subject matter of the Civil Suit.

13. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of.

JASMEET SINGH, J

APRIL 9, 2026/NG