
(2016) 05 SC CK 0085

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Civil Appeal No. 4995 of 2016 (@ Special Leave Petition (C) No. 6250 of 2015)

D.D.A.

APPELLANT

Vs

Raman Grover and Ors.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-05-2016

Acts Referred:

Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 — Section 24

Citation : (2016) AllSCR 1633 : (2016) 5 JT 196 : (2016) 5 Scale 700 : (2016) 14 SCC 101

Hon'ble Judges : Kurian Joseph; Rohinton Fali Nariman, JJ.

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : A.K. Sanghi, Sr. Adv, Ajay Kumar Singh, R.K. Rathore, R.S. Nagar, Harish Khinchi, R.R. Rajesh, D.S. Mahra, Ms. Sushma Suri, Ajay Bansal, AAG, Haryana, Gaurav Yadava, Sanjay Kumar Visen, Ms. Rohini Musa, Zaffar Inayati, Ashwani Kumar, Rahul Bhatia, Ashok Mahamana, Sumit Bansal, Ateev Mathur, Ms. Richa Oberoi, A.P.S. Sehgal, Gagan Gupta, Vikas Kumar, Govind Goel, Ankit Goel, Nilkamal Datta, Dr. Kailash Chand, Advocates, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Kurian, J. - Leave granted.

2. The appellant is before this Court, aggrieved by the Judgment of the High Court, whereby the High Court gave a declaration that the entire land acquisition proceedings have lapsed in view of the operation of Section 24 (2) of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

3. Sh. Amrendra Sharan, learned senior counsel appearing for Delhi Development Authority (DDA), on instruction, fairly concedes that as far as 1100 sq. yards of land belonging to Respondent No. 1 is concerned, the possession has not been taken by DDA, though the award had been passed as far back as in

1986. In that view of the matter, Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act squarely applies in the case and the land acquisition proceedings in respect of the said extent of 1100 sq. yards belonging to Respondent No. 1 shall be deemed to have lapsed.

4. In that view of the matter, the appeal is dismissed.

5. No costs.