



\$~33

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% ***Date of Decision: 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2025***

+ W.P.(C) 2641/2025 & CM APPL. 12555/2025  
LAXMI DHAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Hemant Singh and Ms. Urvashi  
Jain, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Shahana Farah and Ms. Sanna H.,  
Advocates.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Mr. G.L. Dhar (since deceased) had applied for MIG plot under *RRS Scheme 1981*, way back in the year 1981.
2. He was, eventually, allotted a plot in the year 2004 in Sector 29, Rohini, Delhi.
3. He also received a communication in this regard from DDA and submitted all the documents.
4. It is submitted that the entire payment with respect to the abovesaid plot was also made and the possession was also given to the Mr. G.L. Dhar.
5. However, thereafter, he was issued a *show cause notice* as to why the allotment may not be cancelled.
6. Mr. G.L. Dhar expired on 05.06.2018 and, thereafter, his widow i.e.



petitioner herein applied for mutation of the abovesaid property in her name but despite repeated requests and visits, the mutation has yet not been done.

7. Learned counsel for respondent/DDA appears on advance notice and submits that even as per the bare perusal of the averments made in the petition, a *show cause notice* had been issued to the petitioner apprising as to why the allotment in question may not be cancelled as the husband of the petitioner had purchased one another DDA flat and thereby, he had violated the terms and conditions of the allotment.

8. Learned counsel for petitioner, whereas, submits that there is no such violation and that such acquisition has no bearing, being subsequent in time. He submits that even otherwise, as per the policy and rules applicable, the flat size was less than 67 sq. meter and, therefore, viewed from any angle, there is no violation of any rule or policy of DDA. He also relies upon one communication dated 23.07.2018 sent by DDA itself.

9. Be that as it may, this Court would not go into the merits and demerits of the competing claims, as fact remains that the representation made by the petitioner has yet not been decided.

10. Such representation is dated 08.01.2025.

11. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if there is a direction to respondent/DDA to decide the abovesaid representation in a time-bound manner.

12. Learned counsel for respondent also submits that if there is any such direction, they would ensure that the representation is decided as expeditiously as possible.

13. Keeping in mind the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the present petition is disposed of with direction to DDA to decide the abovesaid



2025:DHC:1427



representation dated 08.01.2025 as expeditiously as possible and, preferably, within a period of eight weeks from today.

14. Needless to say, in case so required, DDA would be permitted to give personal hearing to the petitioner/her representative, before taking any final decision in the matter.

15. It is clarified that this Court has not made any observation with respect to the merits of the case.

16. However, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the outcome of her said representation, she would be permitted to take recourse to action, as permissible under law.

17. Petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**MARCH 3, 2025/ss/kt**