



\$~17

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

+ **W.P.(C) 16735/2025**

PRATIBHA KHATRI & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ravin Rao, Mr. Pallav Gupta, Mr. Akshit Sawal, Mr. Ayan Sharma, Ms. Jannat Garg, Mr. Ayush Kumar and Mr. Simran Shokeen, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Sonal Awasthi and Mr. Achint Gupta, Advocates for R-2.
Ms. Zainab Zehra Kazmi, Legal Assistant for DSIIDC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% 20.01.2026

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

- a) *“Directing the Respondents to convert the industrial plot bearing no. H-1446, land measuring 350 SQ. mtrs., situated in the layout plan of Narela Industrial Complex, Narela, Delhi-110040 belonging to the Petitioners, from leasehold to freehold on the basis of conversion charges already paid; and/or*
- b) *Direct the Respondent No.2 to refund the conversion charges amounting to Rs. 18,08,286/- (Rupees Eighteen Lacs Eight Thousand Two Hundred and Eighty-Six Only) along with 15% interest per annum to the Petitioners, from the date of payment till its receipt by the Petitioners, in case the Respondent No.2 insists on deposition of fresh conversion charges as per present rates, for conversion of industrial plot bearing no. H-1446, land measuring 350 SQ. mtrs., situated in the layout plan of Narela Industrial Complex, Narela, Delhi-110040 belonging to the Petitioners;...”*



2. The petitioners claim to have acquired interest in the property which is the subject matter of this petition (subject property), *vide* Registered Sale Agreement and Registered General Power of Attorney, both dated 10.02.2012. Thereafter, the petitioners had applied to respondent no. 2, for conversion of the subject property from leasehold to freehold, after depositing an amount of Rs. 18,08,286/- towards conversion charges.

3. Respondent no. 2 had issued a Show Cause Notice against the petitioners to explain why the aforesaid application should not be rejected in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Suraj Lamp Industries (P) Ltd. v. State of Haryana and Others.***

4. Thereafter, this Court, in W.P. (C) 5964/2018 filed by the petitioners, had directed respondent no. 2 to consider the said application in light of the decision in ***Rajat Dal Mill and Ors v. GNCTD and Others.***¹ Subsequently, the application was rejected.

5. The petitioners again filed W.P. (C) 12519/2023 before this Court seeking setting aside the said order. The said petition was disposed of directing respondent no. 2 to reconsider and expeditiously decide the petitioners' application.

6. The petitioners claim to have, thereafter, submitted representations on two separate occasions in terms of the directions of this Court and in view of the applicable circulars. They also sought that due credit be granted for the amount already deposited towards conversion charges. No order has been passed even in respect of these representations.

7. In view of the aforesaid, respondent no. 2 is directed to decide the petitioner's application with due expedition, within five months from the



date of receipt of this order. If for any reason, the prayer in the application is not accepted, let the authority concerned, to assign specific reasons for the same.

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

9. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

JANUARY 20, 2026

Sh

¹ W.P. © 5962/2018