

---

**(2014) 11 DEL CK 0035**

**In the Delhi High Court**

**Case No :** Writ Petition (Civil) 5679/2014 and CM No. 14045/2014

G.S. Chhabra

APPELLANT

Vs

Union of India

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 10-11-2014

**Acts Referred:**

Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 — Section 24(2)

**Citation :** (2014) 146 DRJ 562

**Hon'ble Judges :** Siddharth Mridul, J; Badar Durrez Ahmed, J

**Bench :** Division Bench

**Advocate :** N.S. Vasisht, M.P. Bhargava, Vishal Singh and Jyoti Kataria, Advocate for the Appellant

---

## **Judgement**

Badar Durrez Ahmed, J.—The petitioner seeks the benefit of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as "the 2013 Act") which came into effect on 01.01.2014. A declaration is sought to the effect that the acquisition proceeding initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as "the 1894 Act") in respect of which Award No. 10/1987-88 dated 14.05.1987 was made, inter alia, in respect of the petitioner's land comprised in Khasra Nos. 439 Min (4-16) and 438 Min (1-0) measuring 5 bighas and 16 biswas in all in village Shayoorpur shall be deemed to have lapsed.

2. Though the respondents claimed that possession of the said land was taken on 14.07.1987, the petitioner disputes this and maintains that physical possession has not been taken. However, insofar as the issue of compensation is concerned, it is an admitted position that it has not been paid.

3. Without going into the controversy of physical possession, this much is clear that the Award was made more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act and the compensation has also not been paid. The necessary ingredients for the application of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act as interpreted by

the Supreme Court and this Court in the following cases stand satisfied:-

(1) Pune Municipal Corporation and Another Vs. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki and Others, ;

(2) Union of India (UOI) and Others Vs. Shiv Raj and Others, ;

(3) Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu and Ors: Civil Appeal No. 8700/2013 decided on 10.09.2014;

(4) Surender Singh v. Union of India & Others: WP(C) 2294/2014 decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court; and

(5) Girish Chhabra v. Lt. Governor of Delhi and Ors: WP(C) 2759/2014 decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court.

4. As a result, the petitioner is entitled to a declaration that the said acquisition proceedings initiated under the 1894 Act in respect of the subject land are deemed to have lapsed. It is so declared.

5. The writ petition is allowed to the aforesaid extent. There shall be no order as to costs.