



\$~50

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5268/2018**

DHANNO RANI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sambhav Shekhar, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Gigi C George, Mr. Sunil Kumar,
Adv. for UOI.

Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC (DDA) with
Mr. Gautam Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Panda, Mr. Anil
Pandey and Mr. Ritank Kumar, Adv.
for R4.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **20.01.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present writ petition is filed by the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, seeking issuance of an appropriate writ directing the Respondent No. 1 to declare the land acquisition proceeding as lapsed as per the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 in respect to 1/4th share in land in *Khasra No.4//26/2* measuring 20 Bigha totalling 1/4th share of 20 *bigha* land at Village Sahipur, New Delhi.
3. The prayer in the present petition is as under:

*“A. pass directions to issue a writ, order or
direction in the nature of mandamus commanding*



the respondents more specifically the respondents No.1 to declare that land acquisition proceeding is lapsed as per the provisions of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, in respect to 1/4th share in land in Khasra No.4//26/2 measuring 20 Bigha totalling 1/4th share of 20 BIGHA land at Village Sahipur, New Delhi, and further pass direction to correct the revenue record in the name of the petitioner in the interest of justice.

B. Award the cost of the petition to this petitioner;

C. Pass any such further order(s)/directions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

4. Counter affidavit has been filed by the Delhi Development Authority (hereinafter, 'DDA') clearly stating that the acquisition had taken place in the year 1959 and the DDA had already released a sum of Rs. 2,00,00,000/- to the Land Department.

5. In any event after the acquisition had taken place, the same was challenged in **W.P.(C) No. 2290 of 1986** titled **Lachhman Singh & Ors. Vs. Union of India & Ors.**, in which this Court had *vide* order dated 10th March, 2005 dismissed the said writ petition on the ground of delay. The said order was challenged by the Petitioners therein before the Supreme Court in **Civil Appeal No. 2850 of 2009** titled '**Rampal (Dead) Thr. Lrs. & Ors. v. Union of India through the land Acquisition Collector & Ors.**' and *vide* order dated 13th July, 2017, the same was dismissed in the following terms:

“Simply on the ground of delay in challenging the Notification, the writ petition has not been entertained and has been rightly dismissed by the High Court. Secondly, the provisions of Right to



Fair Compensation And Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 cannot also be invoiced in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case where acquisition has taken place in the year, 1959.

Consequently, the appeal is dismissed. No order as to costs.”

6. Moreover, in the said **W.P.(C) No. 2290 of 1986**, Sh. Arjun Singh was Petitioner No. 4 and Smt. Dhanno Rani, who is the Petitioner in the present petition is the wife of late Sh. Arjun Singh.

7. In view of the fact that the acquisition has attained finality, the present petition would not be maintainable and the same is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J

MADHU JAIN, J

JANUARY 20, 2026

b/ck