



\$~87

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 4258/2017 & CM APPL. 19203/2017, CM APPL.
26678/2020, CM APPL. 6652/2021, CM APPL. 7825/2022, CM
APPL. 61393/2023, CM APPL. 2001/2026
DDA STAFF RESIDENTS WELFARE ASSOCIATION (REGD.)
.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nandita Rao, Sr. Adv with Adv
Hemant Singh, Adv Urvashi Jain , Adv Aman
Bidhuri, Adv Attrey Gupta

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Chand Chopra, Adv Mr. Sanjay
Katyal, Adv Mr. Gaganmeet Singh Sachdeva, Mr.
Punishk Handa, Mr. Shivam Bansal, Mr.
Harshpeet Singh Chadha, Mr. Nitish Kumar
Danda, Mr. Hridyesh Khanna, Adv

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
13.04.2026

%

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

“A) A Writ of Certiorari calling for the records of the case for perusal;

B) A Writ of Mandamus or order or direction thereby directing the respondent/DDA to allot the temporary allotted flats to group-C&D employees residing in Sector-23, Dwarka at the current costor to take out the scheme for the allotment of flats



to group-C&D employees of the Respondent/DDA...”

2. The facts of the case are that the petitioner association consists of Group-C and D employees working at DDA/ respondent and were allotted temporary quarters in Sector-23, Dwarka as employees of the respondent. The flats were allotted as part of the service condition. Some of the members of the petitioner association have already retired and some are on the verge of retirement.
3. The petitioner has filed the present petition on the ground that similarly situated employees of other association have been granted permanent flats and since the members of the petitioner association are employees of the respondent and have stayed in the aforesaid flats for more than 20 years, they are entitled to ownership of the flats.
4. Additionally, Ms. Rao, learned senior counsel for the petitioners, states that the petitioners are ready and willing to comply with any of the conditions, which the respondent may impose in its wisdom. She also draws my attention that similar flats were allotted to All India Naval Draughtsman Association (“**AINDA**”). She seeks parity with the said allotments.
5. Ms. Chopra, learned counsel for the respondent, draws my attention to the counter affidavit and states that merely because the members of the petitioner association were employed with the respondent it does not confer any rights on the petitioner association to claim permanent allotment of the flat. She further states that the flats are required for by the respondent and the petitioner members have no lien over the said flats.
6. As regards the allotment to the AINDA is concerned, she states that



the respondent has filed a supplementary affidavit, and it has been stated that the allotment was made to AINDA in terms of the authority resolution No. 48/96 dated 22.03.1996, wherein it was resolved to earmark certain flats for allotment to Public Sector Undertaking Organisation. Thus, the allotment to AINDA was made under policy decision involving institutional allotments to organisation and hence, no parity can be claimed.

7. I have heard learned counsels for the parties.
8. The petitioner, in the present petition, is seeking allotment of temporary allotted flats of Group C and D employees. Admittedly, the members of the petitioner association were allotted these flats as being employees of the respondent. They have no lien or entitlement to ownership of these flats, which belonged to the respondent.
9. The petitioner, by way of present petition, in fact is seeking the respondent to make a policy, so that the flats can be sold to the members of the petitioner association.
10. The Courts under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India do not enter into the field of policy decision. The said issue is a purely policy matter within the domain of the respondent being the land-owning agency.
11. As regards parity with AINDA is concerned, the same cannot be drawn since the flats were allotted to AINDA under authority resolution which was again a policy of the respondent existing at that point in time.
12. For the said reasons, I am unable to entertain the present petition and hence, the same is dismissed as the members of the petitioner



association have neither any entitlement to the ownership nor any vested rights *qua* the ownership of the flats in their possession.

13. However, the members of the petitioner association have been staying in these flats for more than 20 years, it is hoped that as and when the petitioner will make a representation to the respondent, the respondent shall consider the same expeditiously. Additionally, the members of the petitioner will pay the due licence fee.
14. The pendency of the representation will not come in the way of the respondent taking possession of the flats in accordance with law and claiming outstanding license fees/damages, if any.

JASMEET SINGH, J

APRIL 13, 2026 / (MS)