



\$~14

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

+ **W.P.(C) 15966/2025**

HASIM

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sachin Jain, Advocate.
Ms. Latika Choudhary, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Maan, Mr. Aditya Singh,
Ms. Smita Maan, Advocates
Ms. Meenakshi Rawat, Mr. Sunil
Singh Rawat and Mr. Vijay P. S.,
Advs.

versus

SUB-REGISTRAR V-A & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhinav Singh and Mr. Rishab
Mittal, Advs. GNCTD.
Mr. Anilendra Pandey and Mr.
Abhishek Kumar, Advocates.
Mr. Sumit Gehlot, Mr. TS Thakran,
Mr. Abhishek Singh and Ms. Manju
Gehlot, Advocates.
Ms. Farhat Jahan Rehmani, ASC &
Mr. Mohammad Danish & Ms.
Fatima Parveen, Advocate
Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel Counsel for
DoE and Mr. Kanishk Maurya,
Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV



%

ORDER
21.01.2026

1. The petition prays for the following reliefs:

“Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, commanding the Respondent No. 1 to forthwith register the Sale Deed dated 11.09.2025, presented by the Petitioner and the vendor on 12.09.2025.

b. Pass any other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice and equity.”

2. The petitioner claims to be a *bona fide* purchaser of the subject property and presented the relevant documents for registration before the concerned Sub-Registrar. As the documents were not registered, the petitioner was constrained to approach this Court.

3. Mr. Abhinav Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondent upon issuance of notice, states that during scrutiny of the documents presented by the petitioner, certain deficiencies were noticed. It is stated that Village Chandanhulla is under consolidation, and as such, the ownership of the subject property has not yet attained finality due to the pendency of consolidation proceedings. It is further stated that for the aforesaid reason, a letter dated 01.10.2025 was issued to the concerned ADM/LAC (South) and the SDM (Mehrauli) seeking a status report regarding the subject property. It is submitted that the issuance of the said letter was only a procedural step, and learned counsel for the respondent clarified that the petitioner's documents have not been rejected.

4. Accordingly, it is submitted that, subject to compliance with the requisite formalities and upon receipt of the land status report, further steps in accordance with law shall be taken.



5. On the other hand, Ms. Smita Maan learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, places reliance on the decisions passed by this court in ***Subhadra Nehru v. State of NCT of Delhi and Ors.***¹ and ***M/s. Ganpati Sales Agency v. Sub-Registrar Mehrauli***². She submits that under similar circumstances, the Court in the aforementioned cases has directed the registration of the documents.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, instead of keeping this petition pending, the same deserves to be disposed of, with the following directions:

- (i) Let the petitioner to approach the concerned Sub-Registrar along with the fresh representations, enclosing a copy of the decisions that is sought to be relied upon.
- (ii) If the petitioner does so, let the Sub-Registrar to take a final decision within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of the application.
- (iii) In case there is any impediment in the registration of the document, and the Sub-Registrar, for any reason whatsoever, comes to the conclusion that the document cannot be registered, let a speaking order be passed and communicated.

7. The petitioner, thereafter, shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

8. If the petitioner's grievance is not mitigated, he shall be entitled to make a request for the revival of the instant petition.

¹ 2023:DHC:6951.

² W.P.(C) 10251/2025.



9. Disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J
JANUARY 21, 2026/JYH