Surender Kumar Gupta vs Government Of Nct Of Delhl & Anr on 8 April, 2022

\$~23-26 (common order)

W.P.(C) 5789/2022

SURENDER KUMAR GUPTA

Author: Mukta Gupta

Bench: Mukta Gupta, Neena Bansal Krishna

```
Represented by: Mr. Rajesh Yadav, Senior
                                Advocate with Ms. Ruchira
                                V. Arora, Advocate.
                     versus
        GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHL & ANR.... Respondents
               Represented by: Mr.Achal Gupta, Advocate fo
                               R-1.
                               Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing
                               Counsel for R-2 with Ms. Jy
                               Tyagi & Ms. Surbhi Arora,
                               Advocates.
                               Mr. Tarun Johri, Advocate w
                               Mr. Ankur Gupta, Advocate f
                               DMRC.
24.
        W.P.(C) 5795/2022
        CM APPL.17340/2022 (for stay)
        VINOD RAJORIA
                 Represented by:
                                         Mr. Rajesh Yadav,
                                         Advocate with Ms.
                                         V. Arora, Advocat
                                versus
        GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.... Respondents
               Represented by: Mr.Anubhav Gupta, Advocate
                               for R-1.
                               Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing
                               Counsel for R-2 with Ms. Jy
                               Tyagi & Ms. Surbhi Arora,
                               Advocates.
                               Mr. Tarun Johri, Advocate w
                               Mr. Ankur Gupta, Advocate f
                               DMRC.
```

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

..... Petition

1

CM APPL.17299/2022 (for stay)

W.P.(C) 5789/2022 & connected matters

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed By:JUSTICE

MUKTA GUPTA

Signing Date: 12.04.2022

18:18:46

25.

+ W.P.(C) 5796/2022

CM APPL.17343/2022 (for stay)

BIRENDER BIR GUPTA

Represented by:

Mr. Rajesh Yadav, Advocate with Ms.

V. Arora, Advocat

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.... Respondents

Represented by: Ms.Asiya Khan, Advocate for

R-1.

Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing Counsel for R-2 with Ms. Jy Tyagi & Ms. Surbhi Arora,

Advocates.

Mr. Tarun Johri, Advocate w Mr. Ankur Gupta, Advocate f

DMRC.

26.

+ W.P.(C) 5803/2022

CM APPL.17368/2022 (for stay)

SHAMSHER SINGH AHLAWAT

..... Petitio

Represented by: Mr. Rajesh Yadav, Senior Advocate with Ms. Ruchira

V. Arora, Advocate.

Versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR..... Respondents

Represented by: Mr.Amandeep Joshi, Advocate

for R-1.

Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing Counsel for R-2 with Ms. Jy Tyagi & Ms. Surbhi Arora,

Advocates.

Mr. Tarun Johri, Advocate w Mr. Ankur Gupta, Advocate f

DMRC.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed By: JUSTICE
MUKTA GUPTA

W.P.(C) 5789/2022 & connected matters

Signing Date: 12.04.2022

18:18:46

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

% 08.04.2022

- 1. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties.
- 2. Since Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (in short, 'DMRC') is a necessary party in the present writ petitions, learned counsel for the petitioners seek lave to implead the DMRC as a party. Amended memo of parties be filed in the course of the day.
- 3. Issue notice to the newly added respondent/DMRC.
- 4. Notice is accepted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the DMRC.
- 5. At this stage we are not inclined to stay the notices bearing Nos. F.1(756)/LA/DC(S)/MRTS/2020/266-269 and F.1(756)/LA/DC(S)/MRTS/2020/270-277, both dated 31st March, 2022 issued by the Government of NCT of Delhi, Land Acquisition Collector (in short, 'LAC')/ respondent No.2 herein, for the reason the notices itself note that the land in question is required for the public utility purposes, that is, for DMRC.
- 6. Claim of the petitioners in these petitions is that the compensation has not been paid to the recorded owners whereas the claim of the respondent No.2/LAC is that the compensation money was deposited as Revenue Deposit (RD) in the name of recorded owners on 29th March, 1988.
- 7. From the record it is further evident that this money was never paid to the recorded owners and when this Court raised the query as to why compensation money was not paid to the recorded owners, learned standing counsel for the LAC states that refund vouchers are issued when a party/claimant file an application for release of the money and since no one came forward for filing an application seeking release of compensation money, no refund vouchers were prepared and the money was utilized for another project.
- 8. A detailed affidavit will be filed by the respondent No.2/LAC in response to the writ petitions and also indicating as to the amount, which the petitioner/ recorded owners will now be liable to receive as compensation.
- 9. Learned counsels for the respondent No.1 and 2 as also newly added respondent No.3/DMRC will file their counter affidavits in relation to the compensation to be paid to the petitioners in lieu of the possession of their property being taken by them within two weeks.
- 10. Rejoinder affidavit be filed within one week thereafter.
- 11. List these petitions on 5th May, 2022.
- 12. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

APRIL 08, 2022 vk