



2026:DHC:8039



\$~12

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 18th September, 2026*

CNR No. DLHC010996312024

+ LA.APP. 1/2025 & CM APPL. 635/2025, CM APPL. 8652/2025

UMED SINGH RANA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Himanshu Upadhyay,
Advocate.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak,
Standing Counsel with Mr.
Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr. M.S.
Akhtar, Ms. Musarrat Benazeer
Hasmi and Mr. Kushagra Dixit,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (Oral)

1. The appellant seeks to challenge the judgment dated 16.07.2018 ('**impugned judgment**') passed by learned Additional District Judge, Rohini Courts, Delhi ('**Reference Court**') in LAC No. 395/2016, pursuant to which the compensation awarded for acquisition of Appellant's land was enhanced, by placing reliance upon the judgment in *Hem Chander Malik v. UOI* in LA APP. 358/2007, decided on **26.09.2011**.

2. Firstly, the record reveals that the appeal has been filed by the appellant with an inordinate delay of 1559 days. The averments in CM



APPL. Nos. 8652/2025 & 635/2025 filed by the Appellant, seeking condonation of delay, have been perused, however, no satisfactory explanation has been brought forth which could constitute *sufficient cause*, to condone the same, that too when the delay is not marginal and the impugned judgment has been passed way back in the year 2018.

3. Even otherwise, a perusal of the impugned judgment reveals that on merits as well, the Appellant has no case.

4. It emerges that the Land Acquisition Collector had determined the market price of the acquired land (*Village-Shahbad Daulatpur*) as Rs. 12.96 lacs per acre. Dissatisfied with the same, the reference under Section 18 was made by the Appellant herein. The enhancement of the compensation was granted by the learned Reference Court noting the submission of the Appellant that he sought enhancement in terms of the judgment passed by this Court in ***Hem Chander Malik*** (*supra*).

The relevant paragraphs of the impugned judgment are as under:

“12. Petitioner contended that valuation of land determined by LAC is not reasonable as LAC has not adopted the correct method of valuation. However, he has not led any evidence to support his contention as to how the LAC was wrong in fixing market value of land. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has only relied upon the judgment titled as Hem Chander Malik Vs. UOI, LA Appeal no. 358/07 decided on 26-09-2011 (Delhi High Court) Chander Malik Vs. UOI and conceded that award be passed in terms of the said judgment and the same enhancement which was granted in the said judgment be also granted to him.

13. In Hem Chander Malik Vs. UOI case (supra), an elaborate and detailed discussion was made before determining the amount of compensation. With respect to the land of the village Shahbad Daulatpur (involved herein), acquired through the same notification (as made herein), the Hon'ble High Court determined the market value of the land as Rs.12,96,455.89/- per acre. Since no different evidence has been led by the petitioner in the present case, I have no reason to give a different treatment to



the land of the petitioner and to give a determination, different from that determined in the *Hem Chander Malik's case (Supra)* case. The fair market value of the acquired land is adjudicated as Rs.12,96,455.89/-per acre as determined in *Hem Chander Malik's case (Supra)*. Accordingly, I hold that the petitioner would be entitled to market value @ Rs, 12,96,455.89/- per acre.

14. Petitioner has also claimed compensation for crops, tree, tubewell etc. However, the petitioner has failed to lead any evidence to substantiate his claim or to establish that he was not awarded sufficient compensation for same. Accordingly, I hold that petitioner is not entitled to any enhancement in compensation on this count.”

(emphasis supplied)

5. It is thus apparent that the Appellant had himself conceded that the enhancement, be granted to him in terms of judgement in ***Hem Chander Malik*** (*supra*), which was admittedly passed in case of similarly placed land owners. Even in regard to compensation of crops and tube-well etc., it has been categorically noted by the learned Reference Court that the Appellant has failed to lead any evidence to substantiate the claim and therefore, was not granted any compensation.

6. The Appellant has not been able to demonstrate any error in the above reasoning and, therefore, in the opinion of this Court, even on merits, no case for further enhancement is made out.

7. Additionally, even otherwise, none of the parties have challenged the judgment passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Hem Chander Malik*** (*supra*) before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

8. In view of the above, as noted by the learned Reference Court, the Appellant would be entitled to same compensation as has been awarded by this Court in the case of ***Hem Chander Malik*** (*supra*) or



2026:DHC:8039



by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

9. In view of the above, the applications seeking condonation of delay along with the appeal, stand dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 18, 2026

DU