

---

**(2018) 07 DEL CK 0497**

**In the Delhi High Court**

**Case No : Regular First Appeal 738 OF 2015**

Union Of India & Anr

APPELLANT

Vs

Jag Mohan Chhabra

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision : 04-07-2018**

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation : (2018) 07 DEL CK 0497**

**Hon'ble Judges : PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J**

**Bench : Single Bench**

**Final Decision : Dismissed**

---

## **Judgement**

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.Â Â

1. The sentiment of Non-Resident Indians (hereinafter, 'NRIs') to be tied to their country is the fulcrum of this dispute. The present appeal is

part of a batch of 26 appeals arising from the same scheme for allotment of lands which was advertised by the Government. All the legal issues are

being determined and decided in the lead matter RFA 765/2015 Union of India v. G.Singh (hereinafter, 'G.Singh'). On facts, separate orders

have been passed in each of the appeals.

2. On 6th February, 1978, the Government of India launched a scheme for 'Allotment of land in Delhi to Non-Resident Indians' (hereinafter,

'the scheme') living abroad to build residential house in Delhi. The scheme was launched by the Ministry of Works and Housing, L&DO. As per

the prospectus and the application form the objective of the scheme was as under:

'Objectives

This scheme is intended to facilitate Non-Resident Indians living abroad to build

residential houses in India and thus to satisfy their natural urge to own property in their own country and to settle down therein whenever they wish to do so. As it is difficult for such persons living abroad to acquire

properties through Government auctions or private dealers, it has been decided to frame a scheme which will facilitate this.

The scheme will, for the present, be introduced in Delhi on an experimental basis.â??

3. Several NRIs applied under the above Scheme for allotment of plots. After applications were made, earnest money was paid and the agreement for

lease was duly signed by them and submitted to the Government, the Appellant herein (hereinafter, â??Governmentâ?). Thereafter, a decision was

taken to revoke the Scheme and cancel the Scheme itself. This led to the filing of writ petitions challenging the said cancellation by the Government.

The cancellation came to be upheld in two judgments of the Delhi High Court in W.P.(C) 2372/1981 titled as R. K. Deka & Ors. v. Union Of India &

Anr and R. K. Deka v. Union of India AIR 1992 Del 53. The Supreme Court also did not interfere with the findings of the Delhi High Court.

4. Apart from the writ petitions, some other Applicants filed civil suits seeking specific performance and damages. The said suits were heard and

disposed of by the Trial Court on 7th April, 2014.

5. First Appeals challenging the said order of the Trial Court have been preferred. The present appeal is one amongst the said batch of cases. The

lead judgment has been passed today in RFA 765/2015 titled Union of India v. G. Singh (hereinafter, â??G. Singhâ?). The facts in the present case

are similar to the case of G. Singh (supra).

6. The Application in the present case was made on 5th May, 1979. Earnest Money Deposit of Rs. 10,000/- was made. The agreement for lease was

also duly signed and sent by the Respondent/Plaintiff (hereinafter, â??Plaintiffâ?). The submission of the same was acknowledged on 6th June, 1979.

On the same date, the Plaintiff was informed that allotment of the plots would be made by the end of 1979. Thus, the Plaintiff had fulfilled all the

formalities. Vide letter dated 5th January, 1980, the Plaintiff sought to know the status of the allotment and sought information regarding, the tentative

allotment schedule, basis of allotment and cost of construction per sq. ft. at the plot. The Government responded on 18th February 1980 that the

allotment of the plot was likely to be made after June 1980, and that the cost of construction would be calculated as per the prevailing market rate at the time of construction of the house.

7. On 19th September 1981, the Government claims to have sent a letter intimating the Plaintiff that it has decided to drop the scheme. However, this letter is disputed by the Plaintiff. By letter dated 26th March, 1983 the Government communicated to the Plaintiff that a decision has been taken to cancel the Scheme. Thereafter the present suit was filed by the Plaintiff seeking the following reliefs:

PRAYER

That the Plaintiff prays that:

(i) a decree for specific performance of the agreement to transfer and convey the perpetual leasehold rights in a plot of land measuring 400 sq. yds.

situate in the area shown in the lay out plan of the land on Badarpur Mehrauli Road, New Delhi as per the scheme; and or

(ii) directing the defendants to transfer the perpetual leasehold rights in the plot measuring 400 sq. yds.; and

(iii) a decree be passed directing the defendants to deliver the vacant and peaceful possession of plot measuring 400 sq. yds. situate in the area shown

in the lay out plan of the land on Badarpur Mehrauli Road, New Delhi on the basis of the already executed deed of conveyance in respect of the said

plot.

(iv) if this Honâble Court finds/holds that the specific performance of the contract or a direction/mandatory injunction directing the defendants to

execute a sale deed in respect of perpetual leasehold rights in the said plot of land measuring 400 sq. yds. situate in the area shown in lay out plan of

the land on Badarpur Mehrauli Road, New Delhi cannot be granted or made, a decree of recovery of Rs.10 lakhs in hard currency (US Dollars) as

damages including recovery of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) in hard currency (US Dollars) paid as part of the plot to the defendants be

passed in favour of the plaintiffs and against the defendants with cost and interest.

The Trial Court decreed the suit vide judgment dated 7th April, 2014.

8. The present Appeal was filed before this Court and on 20th October, 2015, notice was issued in the appeal and the impugned judgment was stayed.

Thereafter it has been taken up for hearing. The issues that arise in this case are the same as in RFA 765/2015 i.e., G. Singh (supra). The four broad

questions that arise in these appeals are-

1) Whether the judgments in the W.P.(C) 2372/1981 titled RK Deka vs. Union of India constitute res judicata?

2) Whether the suits are maintainable in view of the cancellation having been upheld in the above writ petition?

3) Whether the contract between the Government and the Applicants stood concluded?

4) Whether the Applicants/Plaintiffs are entitled to damages/compensation and if so, to what amounts?

9. In the present case, the Plaintiff appeared in person. He submitted that the number of plots was not mentioned in the Scheme. He further submitted

that at the relevant point in time, the plot value in Greater Kailash was only Rs. 150/- per square yards but the Plaintiff had agreed for a 25% premium

only because this was a scheme floated by the Government of India. He submitted that citizens repose enormous faith in the Government and they

should not be left in the lurch in this manner. He also repeatedly referred to the fact that the number of applicants were not very high and in fact the

Government repeatedly extended the date. Most of the applicants would have actually been allotted the plots if the Government had gone ahead with

the Scheme.

10. The submissions made in this case have been considered. All the issues have been decided in favour of the Plaintiff/Respondent by the judgment

of today's date in RFA 765/2015 i.e, G. Singh (supra). The findings therein would be applicable herein and bind the decision in the present Appeal.

11. The Government has, by scrapping the scheme, retained the entire land in its possession and has, hopefully put it to good use. It is prime land

located in Delhi. The Plaintiff has not only litigated with the Government for the last almost 34 years, but he has also been deprived of owning a plot of

400 sq. yds. in a city like Delhi. Thus, compensation is the least that can be given to him under these circumstances. The award of compensation of

Rs.11,20,000/- by taking the market rate prevalent at the time of cancellation in 1983, is a reasonable basis to quantify damages due to breach. The

same is also completely justified in these facts. While this Court does not agree

with some of the observations of the Trial Court in respect of ` acts of criminal negligence`, the conclusion arrived at by the Trial Court, in respect of award of damages, is liable to be upheld.

The amount as per the decree passed by the Trial Court, would be liable to be paid by the Government to the Plaintiff along with 8% interest from the date of filing of suit till the date of payment. The Government is directed to make payment to the Plaintiff within 8 weeks, failing which 12% interest would be payable on the decretal amount. 13. Appeal is dismissed in the above terms.Â Â Â Â Â