



2026:DHC:3860



\$~62 to 69 and 72 to 75

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

+ **W.P.(C) 15632/2025 and CM APPL. 75201/2025**

Date of decision: **22.04.2026.**

IN THE MATTERS OF:-

SMT ANITA JAIN

.....Petitioner

versus

THE GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY & ORS.

.....Respondents

With

- + **W.P.(C) 16836/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 16893/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 16899/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 16903/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 17318/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 16102/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 16563/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 19744/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 19764/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 19797/2025**
- + **W.P.(C) 19799/2025**

Appearances:-

For Petitioners:

Mr. Shiv Charan Garg, Advocate.

For Respondents:-

Mr. Shiven Varma, Panel Counsel for R-1 and 2 in item 63, 69 and 75.

Mr. Raghvendra Upadhyay, Panel Counsel (GNCTD), Ms. Purnima Jain,

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date: 06.05.2026
11:27:23

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By: PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:3860



Ms. Shivpa Taneja, Mr. Madhur, Advocates for R-1 and 2 in item no.65 and 68.

Mr Manashwy Jha, Adv. Panel Counsel (Civil), GNCTD Advocate for R-2 in item no.69.

Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocate for R-GNCTD in item nos. 72 to 75.

Mr.Tushar sannu and Mr. Parvin Bansal Advocates in item nos.62, 64 and 67.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. One of the objections raised by the respondent in the short affidavit is with respect to the alternate remedy available under Section 72 of the Registration Act, 1908 (*'the Act'*).
2. The order passed by the Sub-Registrar is under challenge on various grounds.
3. Having considered the nature of the grievance raised by the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that the issues raised by the petitioner would require consideration of not only legal submissions, but a factual inquiry as well. Such an exercise can be more appropriately undertaken by the Registrar, through a statutory appeal under Section 72 of the Act. There is no reason for this Court, at this stage, to scuttle the appellate body's power to review.
4. Insofar as the question of limitation is concerned, since the petitioners were pursuing the present writ proceedings before this Court, liberty is

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date: 06.05.2026
11:27:23

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By: PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:3860



granted to them to file an application seeking condonation of delay along with the appeal. If such an application is filed, the same shall be considered liberally and in accordance with law.

5. If the appeal is filed by the petitioners within a period of fifteen (15) days from receiving this order, the same should not be rejected on the ground of limitation.

6. Let the appeal to be filed by the petitioners, be decided within a period of three months from the date of filing.

7. With the aforesaid observations and liberty, the instant petitions stand disposed of.

8. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

APRIL 22, 2026

Nc

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date: 06.05.2026
11:27:23

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By: PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV