

Delhi Development Authority

v.

Tejpal & Ors.

Civil Appeal No. 6798 of 2024

17 May 2024

[Surya Kant,* Dipankar Datta and Ujjal Bhuyan, JJ.]

Issue for Consideration

Whether the appellants made out sufficient cause for condonation of delay on the grounds of subsequent change of law brought in by Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra [\[2018\] 2 SCR 1](#) and Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal [\[2020\] 3 SCR 1](#), public interest and justice, COVID-19 pandemic, suppression of material facts by the landowners, leeway to be granted to government entities etc.

Headnotes[†]

Land Acquisition – Land Acquisition Act, 1894 – Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 – s.24(2) – Deemed lapse of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the 1894 Act, on non-payment of compensation or non-taking of possession – Interpretation – Change of law – Condonation of delay sought on the basis of such subsequent change of law – Limitation Act, 1963 – s.24(2) was interpreted in Pune Municipal Corporation v. Harak Chand Mistrimal Solanki [\[2014\] 1 SCR 783](#) and Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu [\[2014\] 7 SCR 799](#) – Following [Pune Municipal Corporation](#) and Sree Balaji, the High Court allowed the landowners’ claim and declared the acquisition proceedings as lapsed on account of non-payment of compensation or non-taking of possession – However, eventually five-judge bench in Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal [\[2020\] 3 SCR 1](#) overruled [Pune Municipal Corporation](#) and [Sree Balaji](#) and Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra [\[2018\] 2 SCR 1](#) – Present cases filed by the appellants before and after the decision in Shailendra as well as after the decision

* Author

Digital Supreme Court Reports

in [Manoharlal](#) in view of re-interpretation of s.24(2) of the 2013 Act therein, against various orders of the High Court whereby acquisition proceedings were declared to have lapsed in terms of s.24(2) – Delay in filing – Condonation of delay sought on the basis of subsequent change of law in view of the decisions in [Shailendra](#) and [Manoharlal](#) – Impermissibility:

Held: In most of the present cases, the prescribed period of limitation had already expired long before the judgments in [Shailendra](#) and [Manoharlal](#) were delivered – Appellants let the limitation period lapse because they saw no case on merits for appeal – However, when the law was subsequently re-interpreted in [Shailendra](#) and [Manoharlal](#), they approached this Court with the present matters – Instead of showing a sufficient cause arising within the period of limitation, the appellants are using an event after the expiry of such period to justify the delay – A party cannot be allowed to take advantage of its deliberate inaction during the limitation period – If subsequent change of law is allowed as a valid ground for condonation of delay, it would open a Pandora's Box where all the cases that were subsequently overruled, or the cases that had relied on such cases, would approach this Court and would seek a relief based on the new interpretation of law – When a case is overruled, it is only its binding nature as a precedent that is taken away and the lis between the parties is still deemed to have been settled by the overruled case – When [Manoharlal](#) overruled [Pune Municipal Corporation](#) and [Sree Balaji](#) and other cases relying on them, it only overruled their precedential value, and did not reopen the lis between the parties – Therefore, the mere fact that the impugned orders in the present case were overruled by [Manoharlal](#) would not be a sufficient ground to argue that the cases should be reopened – Delay cannot be condoned based on subsequent change of law brought in by [Shailendra](#) and [Manoharlal](#). [Paras 22, 25-27, 29]

Land Acquisition – Public interest – Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 – s.24(2) – Condonation of delay in filing appeals sought by the appellants-government entities on grounds of public interest – Public infrastructure projects such as hospitals, schools, expansion of metro, etc. built on a large number of acquired lands – Elements of public interest:

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

Held: While balancing the interest of the public exchequer against that of individuals, there are many other interests at stake, and it might not be possible to undo the acquisitions without causing significant cascading harms and losses to public infrastructure – Effect of non-condonation of delay would go beyond mere financial loss to the exchequer, and instead extend to the public at large – There would be unscrambling the egg if compensation paid would have to be clawed back or possession taken would have to be reversed – In many cases, development projects might also have to be undone – Rights have been vested to the public at large, given the public infrastructure that has come up on a large number of these acquired lands especially, in cases where the possession was taken – When balancing public with private interest, the quantum and adequacy of compensation do not compel much – Hence, the comparative impact on the respondent-landowners would be minimal – Multiplicity of contradictory judicial opinions on s.24(2) of the 2013 Act made the present set of circumstances *sui generis* – The constant flux in the legal position of law created significant challenges for the appellants while approaching this Court – Impact of not condoning the delay, discussed – Larger interest of justice mandates condonation of the delay. [Paras 50-56]

Land Acquisition – Land Acquisition Act, 1894 – Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 – Limitation Act, 1963 – s.17 – Condonation of delay sought on allegations of concealment by respondents-landowners – High Court allowing the landowners’ claim declared the acquisition proceedings as lapsed – Condonation of delay in filing present appeals sought by the appellants-authorities *inter alia* on ground of suppression of material facts by the landowners before High Court in certain cases as regards previous unsuccessful litigations, acquisitions being already complete, landowners being only subsequent purchasers who acquired the lands after they were notified for the acquisition – Scope of inquiry:

Held: Neither the landowners were called upon to refute or admit the allegations of concealment of facts attributed to some of them nor, the appellants were asked to produce original records and documents to substantiate their allegation of concealment and suppression of material facts – Entering into an arena of factual controversy at such an advanced stage of litigation, and

Digital Supreme Court Reports

that too without giving adequate opportunities to the parties can be a potential threat to the cause of justice – No definitive opinion expressed on allegations of concealment – However, appellants have discharged *prima facie* burden for the limited purpose of making out a case for condonation of delay in the cases concerned – A detailed fact-finding inquiry is necessary to ascertain the rightful title-holder and the claimant of receiving the compensation – Hence, there exist sufficient grounds for the condonation of delay – Orders of the High Court set aside in such cases – Relevant writ petitions stand restored on the file of the High Court – Directions issued. [Paras 20, 21, 70]

Limitation Act, 1963 – Objective – s.5 – “sufficient cause”; “within such period” – Law as regards condonation of delay – Discussed.

Limitation Act, 1963 – “sufficient cause” – Condonation of delay – Subsequent overruling of a judgement cannot be a sufficient cause for condonation of delay – Exception:

Held: Cases pending before this Court will be an exception – If the *lis* is still pending and has not reached finality, those cases would be decided on the basis of five-judge bench decision in *Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal* [2020] 3 SCR 1 as a decision on the interpretation of law is applied retrospectively unless the court specifically rules as to its prospective applicability. [Paras 29, 30]

Judgments/Orders – Judgments interpreting law – Applicability:

Held: Judgment interpreting law is applied retrospectively unless specifically made prospective. [Para 30]

Land Acquisition – Limitation – Delay on part of government entities – Condonation of – Government entities, if to be allowed leeway for:

Held: The delay cannot be condoned mechanically only because the appellant is a government entity – Government entities must show *bona fide* and demonstrate diligence in pursuing the matter – The proposition that government entities ought to be afforded greater latitude on issues of delay on account of administrative exigencies, is no longer a precedent to be followed routinely – If delay were to be condoned merely on the basis of a broad general assertion of bureaucratic indifference, without requiring

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

demonstration of bona fide or an act of mala fide on the part of specific individuals, it would create an artificial distinction between the private parties and the government entities *vis-à-vis* the law of limitation which would not be in conformity with the spirit of equality before law as guaranteed under the Constitution – Allowing such latitude would further distort incentives for the government and encourage more laxity by the bureaucracy in its general functioning, thereby undermining quality governance. [Paras 35, 39]

Land Acquisition – Limitation – COVID-19 pandemic – Cases filed after the expiration of the period of limitation – Appellants sought condonation of delay *inter alia* on account of COVID-19 pandemic – Order dtd.23.03.2020 passed in In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation whereby period of limitation was extended for proceedings before all courts/tribunals in the country from 15.03.2020 till further orders, and various orders passed by this Court from time to time – Benefit thereof, if can be availed by appellants:

Held: No – Orders passed In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation were intended to benefit vigilant litigants who were prevented due to the pandemic and the lockdown, from initiating proceedings within the period of limitation prescribed by general or special law – Appellants can avail the benefit of the aforesaid order only in a case where the period of limitation expired between 15.03.2020 and 28.02.2022 – Thus, if the delay occurred on account of the COVID-19 pandemic as laid down in In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation, such delay can be condoned. [Paras 45, 64]

Constitution of India – Article 142 – Exercise of powers under – Land Acquisition – Cases where appellants did not take possession of the acquired land and also did not pay compensation and thus, cannot seek protection under Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal [\[2020\] 3 SCR 1](#) – Non-conclusion of acquisition proceedings – Exercise of powers u/Article 142:

Held: Substantial harm would ensue towards the public at large if the acquisition proceedings are not concluded promptly – To prevent such an outcome and after considering the unique facts and circumstances of such batch of cases, powers exercised u/ Article 142 in the interests of doing complete justice – Directions issued. [Para 72, 73]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

Case Law Cited

State of Manipur v. Koting Lamkang [\[2019\] 13 SCR 565](#) : (2019) 10 SCC 408; *Sheo Raj Singh v. Union of India* [\[2023\] 13 SCR 743](#) : (2023) SCC OnLine SC 1278 – distinguished.

GNCTD (through Secretary, Land and Building Dept.) v. KL Rathi Steels Ltd. **MA No. 414/2023**; *Pune Municipal Corporation v. Harak Chand Mistrimal Solanki* [\[2014\] 1 SCR 783](#) : (2014) 3 SCC 183; *Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu* [\[2014\] 7 SCR 799](#) : (2015) 3 SCC 353; *Yogesh Neema v. State of Madhya Pradesh* (2016) 6 SCC 387; *Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra* (2018) 1 SCC 733; *Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra* [\[2018\] 2 SCR 1](#) : (2018) 3 SCC 412; *State of Haryana v. GD Goenka Tourism Corporation Ltd.* (2018) 3 SCC 585; *Indore Development Authority v. Shyam Verma* (2020) 15 SCC 342; *State of Haryana v. Maharana Pratap Charitable Trust (Regd.)* (2018) SCC Online SC 3600; *Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal* [\[2020\] 3 SCR 1](#) : (2020) 8 SCC 129; *Commissioner of Customs v. Candid Enterprises* (2002) 9 SCC 764; *CIT v. Saurashtra Kutch Stock Exchange Ltd.* [\[2008\] 13 SCR 421](#) : (2008) 14 SCC 171; *Collector (LA), Anantnag v. Katiji* [\[1987\] 2 SCR 387](#) : (1987) 2 SCC 107; *G. Ramegowda v. Spl. Land Acquisition Officer* [\[1988\] 3 SCR 198](#) : (1988) 2 SCC 142; *Imrat Lal v. LAC* (2014) 14 SCC 133; *Neelima Srivastava v. State of UP* [\[2021\] 8 SCR 167](#) : (2021) SCC Online SC 610; *Natural Resources Allocation, In re, Special Reference 1 of 2012* [\[2012\] 9 SCR 311](#) : (2012) 10 SCC 1; *Postmaster General v. Living Media India Ltd* [\[2012\] 1 SCR 1045](#) : (2012) 3 SCC 563; *Sagufa Ahmed v. Upper Assam Plywood Products (P) Ltd.* [\[2020\] 9 SCR 472](#) : (2021) 2 SCC 317; *Pundlik Jalam Patil v. Executive Engineer, Jalgaon Medium Project* [\[2008\] 15 SCR 135](#) : (2008) 17 SCC 448; *Kumudini Ramdas Shah v. K.M. Mody* AIR (1985) Bombay 320; *Basawaraj v. Land Acquisition Officer* [\[2013\] 8 SCR 227](#) : (2013) 14 SCC 81; *Perumon Bhagvathy Devaswom v. Bhargavi Amma* [\[2008\] 11 SCR 1](#) : (2008) 8 SCC 321; *Raheem Shah v. Govind Singh* [\[2023\] 10 SCR 913](#) : (2023) SCC OnLine SC 910; *Sarpanch, Lonand Gram Panchayat v. Ramgiri Gasavi & Anr.* [\[1967\] 3 SCR 774](#) : (1967) SCC OnLine SC 105; *Ramlal v. Rewa Coalfields Ltd.* [\[1962\] 2 SCR 762](#) : (1961) SCC OnLine SC 3; *Ummer v. Pottengal Subida* [\[2018\] 3 SCR 596](#) : (2018) 15 SCC 127; *Meera Sahni v. Lt. Governor of Delhi* [\[2008\] 10 SCR 1012](#) : (2008) 9 SCC 177; *Ajit Singh Thakur v. State of Gujarat* [\[1981\]](#)

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

[2 SCR 509](#) : (1981) 1 SCC 495; *Tilokchand & Motichand v. H.B. Munshi* [\[1969\] 2 SCR 824](#) : (1969) 1 SCC 110; *Neelima Srivastava v. State of Uttar Pradesh* [\[2021\] 8 SCR 167](#) : (2021) SCC Online SC 610; *R. Unnikrishnan v. V.K. Mahanudevan* [\[2014\] 1 SCR 350](#) : (2014) 4 SCC 434; *Shyam Madan Mohan Ruia v. Messer Holdings Ltd.* [\[2019\] 15 SCR 396](#) : (2020) 5 SCC 252; *Foreshore Coop. Housing Society Ltd. v. Praveen D. Desai.* [\[2015\] 5 SCR 1075](#) : (2015) 6 SCC 412; *Nusli Neville Wadia v. Ivory Properties* [\[2019\] 15 SCR 795](#) : (2020) 6 SCC 557; *Commissioner of Wealth Tax v. Amateur Riders Club* (1994) Supp. 2 SCC 603; *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Bherulal* [\[2020\] 8 SCR 912](#) : (2020) 10 SCC 654; *In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation* (2020) 19 SCC 10; *State of Jharkhand v. Lalu Prasad Yadav* [\[2017\] 3 SCR 630](#) : (2017) 8 SCC 1; *High Court of Judicature of Patna v. Madan Mohan Prasad* [\[2011\] 13 SCR 972](#) : (2011) 9 SCC 65; *GNCTD v. BSK Realtors SLP(C)* Diary No. 17623/2021 – referred to.

List of Acts

Land Acquisition Act, 1894; Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013; Limitation Act, 1963; Constitution of India; Supreme Court Rules, 2013.

List of Keywords

Land acquisition; Subsequent change of law; Contradictory judicial opinions; Law re-interpreted; Re-interpretation of law; Subsequent overruling of a judgement; Limitation; Condonation of delay; Sufficient cause for condonation of delay; Compensation deposited in the treasury; Possession not taken; Compensation not paid; Non-payment of compensation; Non-taking of possession; Acquisition proceedings declared to have lapsed; Period of limitation already expired; Delay not justified; Condonation of delay on ground of public interest; Sui generis; Deemed lapse of land acquisition proceedings; Public infrastructure projects such as hospitals, schools, metro; Public infrastructure projects built on acquired lands; Interest of the public exchequer; Financial loss to the public exchequer; Balancing public with private interest; Government entities; Equality before law; Concealment; Suppression of material facts by landowners; Detailed fact-finding inquiry; COVID-19 pandemic; condonation of delay on account of COVID-19 pandemic; Condonation of delay without issuing notice; Judgments interpreting law; Retrospectively; Prospectively; *Bona fide*; Diligence.

Digital Supreme Court Reports**Case Arising From**

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION: Special Leave Petition(C) No. 26697 of 2019

From the Judgment and Order dated 14.11.2017 of the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in WPC No.4427 of 2016

With

SLP(C) No.31870 of 2018, SLP(C)No. 32417 of 2018, SLP(C) No.22996 of 2015, C.A. No.1012 of 2017, SLP(C) No.3061-3062 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3063-3064 of 2018, SLP (C) No. 3065-3066 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3067-3068 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3069-3070 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3043-3044 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3047-3048 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3052-3053 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3054-3055 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3056-3057 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 3058-3059 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 740 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 2877 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 16349 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 12600 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 2259 of 2020, Diary No. 28682 of 2021, M.A. No.45 of 2023, In C.A. No.8649 of 2016, SLP (C) No.3071-3072 of 2018, SLP (C) No.738 of 2018, SLP (C) No.2876 of 2018, SLP (CIVIL) No. 2878 of 2018, SLP (C) No.5818 of 2018, Diary No. 8523 of 2018, SLP (C) No.16350 of 2018, SLP (C) No.16351 of 2018, SLP (C) No.16352 of 2018, SLP (C) No.16353 of 2018, SLP (C) No.16016 of 2021, SLP (C) No.28439 of 2018, SLP (C) No. 30446 of 2018, Diary No.28683 of 2021, SLP (C) No.30102 of 2018, SLP (C) No.30103 of 2018, SLP (C) No.31862 of 2018, SLP (C) No.31868 of 2018, SLP (C) No.31869 of 2018, SLP (C) No.32414 of 2018, SLP (C) No.32415 of 2018, SLP (C) No.32416 of 2018, SLP (C) No.394 of 2019, SLP (C) No.9059 of 2019, SLP (C) No.7948 of 2019, SLP (C) No.7950 of 2019, SLP (C) No.7949 of 2019, SLP (C) No.9061 of 2019, MA No. 1268 of 2019 In R.P. (C) 406 of 2017 In CA No. 8674 of 2016, Diary No.21692 of 2019, SLP (C) No.21759 of 2019, SLP (C) No.20908 of 2019, SLP (C) No.20798 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22808 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22847 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22859 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22849 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22860 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22851 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22862 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22863 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22864 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22865 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22853 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22854 of 2019, SLP (C) No.22855 of 2019, SLP (C) No.29190 of 2019, SLP (C) No.29191 of 2019, SLP (C) No.29192 of 2019, SLP (C) No.24781 of 2019, MA No. 1267 of

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

2019 In R.P.(C)No.411 of 2017 In C.A. No. 8726 of 2016, MA No. 2622 of 2019 In R.P.(C) No.405 of 2017 In C.A. No. 8906 of 2016, Diary No. 45820 of 2019, Diary No. 45830 of 2019, SLP(C) No.4251 of 2020, MA No. 804 of 2020 In Diary No. 8569 of 2019, MA No.629 of 2020 In Diary No. 8538 of 2019, MA No. 627 of 2020 In Diary No. 8550 of 2019, MA No. 628 of 2020 In Diary No.21269 of 2019, MA 700 of 2020 In Diary No. 8562 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 14308 of 2020, Diary No. 23683 of 2020, Diary No. 24250 of 2020, Diary No. 24253 of 2020, Diary No. 24368 of 2020, Diary No. 24491 of 2020, Diary No. 24494 of 2020, Diary No. 24367 of 2020, Diary No. 28960 of 2020, Diary No. 28985 of 2020, Diary No.118 of 2021, Diary No. 1698 of 2021, Diary No.2001 of 2021, Diary No. 2927 of 2021, Diary No.4276 of 2021, Diary No. 7862 of 2021, Diary No. 9555 of 2021, Diary No. 10043 of 2021, SLP(C) No. 16015 of 2021, Diary No. 17877 of 2021, Diary No. 26605 of 2021, Diary No. 28686 of 2021, Diary No. 29096 of 2021, SLP(C) No. 16348 of 2018, SLP(C) No.26088 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 26089 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 26393 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 31309 of 2018, SLP(C) No.10154 of 2019, SLP(C)No.2260 of 2020, Diary No. 22128 of 2021, Diary No. 26601 of 2021, Diary No. 26687 of 2021, Diary No. 28978 of 2021, Diary No. 29094 of 2021, Diary No. 3096 of 2022, Diary No. 10284 of 2022, Diary No.11493 of 2022, Diary No. 12203 of 2022, Diary No. 12377 of 2022, Diary No. 12659 of 2022, Diary No. 12924 of 2022, SLP(C) No.20209 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 20206 of 2018, SLP(C)No. 20207 of 2018, SLP(C) No.21273 of 2018, SLP(C)No. 22115 of 2018, SLP(C) No.28438 of 2018, SLP(C) No.28440 of 2018, SLP(C) No.29159 of 2018, SLP(C) No.32932 of 2018, SLP(C) No.6457 of 2019, SLP(C) No.11170 of 2019, Diary No. 17118 of 2021, SLP(C) No. 21608 of 2022, Diary No. 11765 of 2022, Diary No. 19545 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 18608 of 2022, MA No.46 of 2023 In RP Diary No. 20336 of 2019, In CA No. 8649 of 2016, Diary No. 501 of 2023, Diary No. 15687 of 2022, Diary No. 21004 of 2022, Diary No. 21033 of 2022, Diary No.21052 of 2022, Diary No. 27935 of 2022, Diary No. 27959 of 2022, M.A. Diary No. 37562 of 2022 In RP Diary No. 23724 of 2019 In CA No. 8654 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 40294 of 2022 In CA No.8926 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 40305 of 2022 In CA No. 11818 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 40310 of 2022 In RP 1017 of 2017 In CA No. 11818 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 40767 of 2022 In RP Diary No. 45469 of 2019 In CA No. 8926 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 40773 of 2022 In CA No.6230 of 2017, M.A. Diary No.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

446 of 2023 In CA No.6262 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 522 of 2023 In CA No. 8895 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 541 of 2023 In Diary No. 5020 of 2020, M.A. Diary No. 11554 of 2023 In C.A. No. 10747 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 4743 of 2023 In RP Diary No. 2715 of 2021 In SLP(C) No.13650 of 2016, Diary No. 5385 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 3259 of 2019,SLP(C) No.22434 of 2019, Diary No. 20223 of 2021, Diary No. 2 of 2022, Diary No. 2588 of 2022, M.A. Diary No. 39883 of 2022 In CA No. 6259 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 42742 of 2022 In RP Diary No. 17062 of 2019 In CA No.6187 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 42745 of 2022 In CA No.6187 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 411 of 2023 In CA No.6187 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 1015 of 2023 In RP Diary No. 25698 of 2020 In CA No. 8711 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 1460 of 2023 In RP Diary No. 21372 of 2019 In CA No.6269 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 1464 of 2023 In RP Diary No. 24205 of 2019 In CA No.6247 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 1466 of 2023 In Diary No. 38548 of 2019, M.A. Diary No. 4091 of 2023 In Diary No.4904 of 2020, M.A. Diary No. 4510 of 2023 In SLP(C) No. 13650 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 4990 of 2023 In Diary No.32548 of 2021, M.A. Diary No. 6523 of 2023 In Diary No.27181 of 2021, M.A. Diary No. 6524 of 2023 In Diary No.4221 of 2022, M.A. Diary No. 10561 of 2023 In Diary No. 14138 of 2022, Diary No. 24674 of 2022, Diary No. 724 of 2023, MA No.1626 of 2023 In Diary No.9024 of 2019, M.A. Diary No. 1137 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8689 of 2016, Diary No. 3958 of 2023, Diary No. 8250 of 2023, Diary No. 11257 of 2023, MA No.1643 of 2023 In R.P.(C) No.556 of 2017 In C.A. No.8477 of 2016, Diary No. 11591 of 2023, Diary No. 12025 of 2023, Diary No. 12338 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 12639 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 12978 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 13159 of 2023, Diary No. 13549 of 2023, Diary No. 14584 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 14601 of 2023, Diary No. 14703 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 14854 of 2023, Diary No. 15173 of 2023, Diary No. 15177 of 2023, Diary No. 15266 of 2023, Diary No. 8581 of 2022, Diary No. 10729 of 2023, Diary No. 11587 of 2023, Diary No. 11597 of 2023, Diary No. 13594 of 2023, Diary No. 13738 of 2023, Diary No. 13991 of 2023, Diary No. 14018 of 2023, Diary No. 14075 of 2023, Diary No. 15542 of 2023, Diary No. 15544 of 2023, Diary No. 15550 of 2023, Diary No. 15557 of 2023, Diary No. 15806 of 2023, Diary No. 15812 of 2023, Diary No. 15815 of 2023, Diary No. 15819 of 2023, Diary No. 16246 of 2023, Diary No. 16723 of 2023, Diary No. 16975 of 2023, Diary No. 17063 of 2023, Diary No. 17124 of 2023, Diary No. 17208 of 2023, Diary No. 17829 of

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

2023, Diary No. 22888 of 2022, Diary No. 27992 of 2022, Diary No. 28055 of 2022, Diary No. 28446 of 2022, Diary No. 32409 of 2022, M.A. Diary No. 11767 of 2023 In Diary No. 27340 of 2019, Diary No. 14692 of 2023, Diary No. 14751 of 2023, Diary No. 14789 of 2023, Diary No. 14797 of 2023, Diary No. 14860 of 2023, Diary No. 15284 of 2023, Diary No. 15286 of 2023, Diary No. 15531 of 2023, Diary No. 15535 of 2023, Diary No. 15558 of 2023, Diary No. 15805 of 2023, Diary No. 17832 of 2023, Diary No. 18111 of 2023, Diary No. 18183 of 2023, Diary No. 18684 of 2023, Diary No. 19217 of 2023, Diary No. 19983 of 2023, Diary No. 21126 of 2023, Diary No. 21535 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 3041-3042 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 2272 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 6568 of 2020, Diary No. 29182 of 2021, Diary No. 30749 of 2021, Diary No. 23688 of 2022, Diary No. 25278 of 2022, Diary No. 32408 of 2022, Diary No. 37246 of 2022, M.A. Diary No. 2556 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 2941 of 2023, Diary No. 4587 of 2023, MA No.1642 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8477 of 2016, Diary No. 12373 of 2023, Diary No. 12955 of 2023, Diary No. 13544 of 2023, Diary No. 14180 of 2023, Diary No. 17211 of 2023, Diary No. 18682 of 2023, Diary No. 19084 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 8775 of 2016, Diary No. 20119 of 2023, Diary No. 21669 of 2023, Diary No. 21997 of 2023, Diary No. 22457 of 2023, Diary No. 22486 of 2023, Diary No. 22524 of 2023, CIVIL APPEAL No. 8565 of 2016, Diary No. 29314 of 2022, Diary No. 30121 of 2022, Diary No. 38953 of 2022, Diary No. 39904 of 2022, Diary No. 102 of 2023, M.A. No. 1761 of 2023 In CIVIL APPEAL No. 8911 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 1465 of 2023 In Diary No. 30311 of 2021, M.A. Diary No. 4083 of 2023 In CA 8917 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 4086 of 2023 In Diary No. 16897 of 2019, M.A. Diary No. 4242 of 2023 In Diary No. 32658 of 2021, Diary No. 8141 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 10980 of 2023 In CANO 9287 of 2022, M.A. Diary No.11562 of 2023 In CA NO 8637 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 12740 of 2023 In Diary No. NO 9299 of 2019, M.A. Diary No.13420 of 2023 In CA NO 6227 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 13541 of 2023 In CA NO 8525 of 2016, M.A. No. 1722 of 2023 In CA No. 8537 of 2016, Diary No. 14869 of 2023, Diary No. 17744 of 2023, Diary No. 21344 of 2023, CIVIL APPEAL NO 5539 of 2017, R.P.(C)No.1882 of 2017, In CIVIL APPEAL No. 8705 of 2016, R.P.(C)No.1637 of 2017, In CIVIL APPEAL No. 11581 of 2016, R.P.(C)No.1113 of 2018, In CIVIL APPEAL No. 9899 of 2016, R.P.(C)No.2438 of 2017, In CIVIL APPEAL No. 8924 of 2016, R.P. Diary No. 6303 of 2018 In CA NO 6183 of 2017, R.P. Diary No.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

18945 of 2018 In CA NO 6235 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 20202 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 21275 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 29144 of 2018, Diary No. 29714 of 2018, R.P. Diary No. 35922 of 2018 In CA 6263 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 30454 of 2018, R.P. Diary No. 26490 of 2019 In CA 9031 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 2463 of 2020, M.A Diary No. 37093 of 2022 In CA NO 8654 of 2016, M.A.D. NO 40963 of 2022 In Diary No. NO 5204 of 2020, M.A Diary No. 515 of 2023 In CA NO 8711 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 527 of 2023 In CA NO 8617 of 2016, M.A. No. 1625 of 2023 In CIVILAPPEAL No. 8584 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 4967 of 2023 In Diary No. 7759 of 2022, M.A Diary No. 12592 of 2023 In Diary No. 10856 of 2022, M.A Diary No. 12635 of 2023 In CA No.8154 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 13155 of 2023 In CA No. 8663 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 13323 of 2023 In RP No. 387 of 2017, M.A Diary No. 13153 of 2023, M.A Diary No. 700 of 2020, M.A Diary No. 14845 of 2023 In CA No. 8560 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 22699 of 2023 In CA No. 12249 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 24734 of 2023 In Diary No. 26345 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 36423 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 3825 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 20210 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 28442 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 31861 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 4399 of 2019, Diary No. 1456 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 5812 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 5347 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 15081 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 4077 of 2020, Diary No. 2407 of 2022, M.A Diary No. 12238 of 2022 In RP(C) 400 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 17053 of 2022, M.A Diary No. 668 of 2023 In SLP(C) NO 30141 of 2015, M.A Diary No. 1001 of 2023 In Diary No. 23340 of 2018, M.A Diary No. 1136 of 2023 In Diary No. 30020 of 2019, M.A Diary No. 1291 of 2023 In Diary No. NO 29016 of 2021, M.A Diary No. 2121 of 2023 In RP NO 2163 of 2018, M.A Diary No. 3578 of 2023 In Diary No. NO 32559 of 2021, M.A Diary No. 4477 of 2023 In Diary No. NO 24053 of 2019, M.A Diary No. 14353 of 2023 In CA NO 4580 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 23142 of 2023 In Diary No. NO 15269 of 2021, SLP(C) No. 584 of 2017, M.A Diary No. 17789 of 2017 In SLP(C) No. 14715 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 20205 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 20459 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 29157 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 32412 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 14576 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 15071 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 4073 of 2020, M.A. No. 626 of 2020 In Diary No. 8542 of 2019, Diary No. 9841 of 2022, Diary No. 10218 of 2022, Diary No. 23770 of 2022, M.A Diary No. 41774 of 2022 In CA No. 8562 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 41777 of 2022 In Diary No. 22936 of 2021, M.A Diary No. 42064 of 2022 In CA No. 8685 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 42071 of 2022 In Diary No.1090 of 2020, M.A Diary No.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

42406 of 2022 In Diary No. 14203 of 2019, M.A Diary No. 42459 of 2022 In CA No. 8651 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 402 of 2023 In Diary No. 27346 of 2019, M.A. No. 1647 of 2023 In CIVIL APPEAL No. 8566 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 3484 of 2023 In CA No. 8530 of 2016, M.A Diary No. 4367 of 2023 In Diary No. 2379 of 2021, M.A Diary No. 11686 of 2023 In Diary No. 9844 of 2022, M.A Diary No. 11706 of 2023 In Diary No. 38549 of 2019, M.A Diary No. 14289 of 2023 In CA No. 8493 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 28277 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 20203 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 30451 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 29611 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 29825 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 4398 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 7945 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 10386 of 2019, Diary No. 19172 of 2019, M.A. No. 2327 of 2019 In R.P.(C)No. 401 of 2017 In CIVIL APPEAL No. 8541 of 2016, Diary No. 41950 of 2019, Diary No. 7191 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 4110 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 4114 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 4895 of 2020, Diary No. 1558 of 2020, Diary No. 22256 of 2021, Diary No. 22630 of 2021, Diary No. 24734 of 2021, Diary No. 28767 of 2021, Diary No. 18034 of 2022, Diary No. 24353 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 8797 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 8761 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 8768 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 5910 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 8776 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 8766 of 2016, CIVIL APPEAL No. 5538 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 4873 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 16251 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 28219 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 8323 of 2019, M.A.No. 1416 of 2019 In R.P.(C)No.551 of 2017 In C.A. No. 508 of 2016, M.A. No. 611 of 2020 In Diary No. 8552 of 2019, Diary No. 6926 of 2020, Diary No. 13525 of 2022, Diary No. 31393 of 2021, Diary No. 31839 of 2021, Diary No. 1359 of 2022, Diary No. 2441 of 2022, Diary No. 15864 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 21557 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 30445 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 14565 of 2019, Diary No. 24244 of 2020, Diary No. 24247 of 2020, Diary No. 9458 of 2021, Diary No. 21978 of 2022, Diary No. 27649 of 2022, Diary No. 39067 of 2022, Diary No. 937 of 2023, Diary No. 1204 of 2023, Diary No. 9194 of 2023, Diary No. 11258 of 2023, Diary No. 12596 of 2023, Diary No. 14064 of 2023, Diary No. 30619 of 2023, Diary No. 31083 of 2023, Diary No. 31971 of 2023, Diary No. 31977 of 2023, Diary No. 31982 of 2023, M.A. No. 525 of 2020 In Diary No.8541 of 2019, Diary No. 19652 of 2022, Diary No. 28063 of 2022, Diary No. 29641 of 2022, Diary No. 29697 of 2022, Diary No. 31979 of 2022, Diary No. 35924 of 2022, Diary No. 38890 of 2022, Diary No. 39310 of 2022, Diary No. 41084 of 2022, Diary No. 41445 of 2022, Diary No. 41703 of 2022, Diary No. 42045 of 2022, Diary No. 77 of 2023, M.A. No. 1931

Digital Supreme Court Reports

of 2023 In SLP(C)No.6367 of 2016, Diary No. 4841 of 2023, Diary No. 6339 of 2023, Diary No. 12327 of 2023, Diary No. 12328 of 2023, Diary No. 12331 of 2023, Diary No. 13357 of 2023, Diary No. 20490 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 3743 of 2019, Diary No. 8804 of 2020, Diary No. 25769 of 2020, Diary No. 41531 of 2022, Diary No. 42660 of 2022, Diary No. 3079 of 2023, Diary No. 3747 of 2023, Diary No. 15734 of 2023, Diary No. 21224 of 2023, Diary No. 21946 of 2023, Diary No. 30089 of 2023, Diary No. 31074 of 2023, Diary No. 31966 of 2023, Diary No. 31968 of 2023, Diary No. 31969 of 2023, Diary No. 31974 of 2023, Diary No. 32234 of 2023, Diary No. 32665 of 2023, Diary No. 32916 of 2023, Diary No. 33172 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 33345 of 2015, Diary No. 39526 of 2017, R.P.(C)No.1 of 2018 In CIVIL APPEAL No. 2980 of 2017, Diary No. 7178 of 2018, Diary No. 7195 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 228 of 2019, Diary No. 10266 of 2019, Diary No. 15896 of 2019, Diary No. 21134 of 2020, Diary No. 22116 of 2020, Diary No. 762 of 2022, Diary No. 15572 of 2022, Diary No. 13481 of 2023, Diary No. 15001 of 2023, Diary No. 15004 of 2023, Diary No. 15543 of 2023, Diary No. 15738 of 2023, Diary No. 19215 of 2023, Diary No. 27410 of 2023, Diary No. 33206 of 2023, Diary No. 7167 of 2018, Diary No. 7174 of 2018, Diary No. 7184 of 2018, Diary No. 8479 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 2034 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 12894 of 2019, Diary No. 8454 of 2021, Diary No. 21831 of 2021, Diary No. 21920 of 2021, Diary No. 29643 of 2021, Diary No. 9201 of 2022, Diary No. 10476 of 2022, Diary No. 10477 of 2022, Diary No. 14597 of 2022, Diary No. 15623 of 2022, Diary No. 29310 of 2022, Diary No. 29650 of 2022, Diary No. 37815 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 8791 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 8773 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 28212 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 29614 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 1382 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 395 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 12155 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 12601 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 22131 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 22412 of 2019, Diary No. 41709 of 2019, Diary No. 4034 of 2020, Diary No. 24631 of 2020, Diary No. 15170 of 2021, Diary No. 30585 of 2021, Diary No. 1377 of 2022, Diary No. 12518 of 2022, Diary No. 21072 of 2022, Diary No. 29678 of 2022, Diary No. 3283 of 2023, M.A. No. 381 of 2023 In Diary No. 14790 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 15346 of 2015, SLP(C) No. 4299 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 4155 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 19817 of 2018, Diary No. 28634 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 30101 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 14569 of 2019, Diary No. 21380 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 5308 of 2020, Diary No. 4029 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 14851 of 2020, Diary No. 14829 of 2021, Diary No. 26604

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

of 2021, Diary No. 29548 of 2021, Diary No. 29803 of 2021, Diary No. 27923 of 2022, Diary No. 27975 of 2022, Diary No. 27989 of 2022, Diary No. 42036 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 8758 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 4298 of 2017, SLP(C) No. 22691 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 20458 of 2018, Diary No. 26635 of 2018, Diary No. 21381 of 2019, Diary No. 21382 of 2019, Diary No. 27464 of 2019, Diary No. 7493 of 2020, Diary No. 8470 of 2020, Diary No. 28956 of 2020, Diary No. 28987 of 2020, Diary No. 28988 of 2020, Diary No. 28993 of 2020, Diary No. 29070 of 2020, Diary No. 1894 of 2021, Diary No. 29032 of 2021, Diary No. 29097 of 2021, SLP(C) No. 13046 of 2022, Diary No. 5024 of 2022, Diary No. 7087 of 2022, Diary No. 9433 of 2022, Diary No. 13505 of 2022, Diary No. 20620 of 2022, Diary No. 38278 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 23373 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 23369 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 8320 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 14573 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 5509 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 26698 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 27211 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 10674 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 937 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 947 of 2020, Diary No. 17418 of 2021, Diary No. 17613 of 2021, Diary No. 18136 of 2021, Diary No. 19415 of 2021, Diary No. 29111 of 2021, Diary No. 12519 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 14207 of 2022, Diary No. 28059 of 2022, Diary No. 4601 of 2023, Diary No. 7087 of 2023, Diary No. 35484 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 10169 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 3060 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 27689 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 25394 of 2018, Diary No. 21739 of 2019, Diary No. 21741 of 2019, Diary No. 22098 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 2264 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 4923 of 2020, Diary No. 21888 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 11135 of 2023, Diary No. 15399 of 2021, Diary No. 29098 of 2021, Diary No. 30583 of 2021, Diary No. 381 of 2022, Diary No. 1564 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 18861 of 2023, Diary No. 20979 of 2022, Diary No. 4860 of 2023, Diary No. 5564 of 2023, Diary No. 7061 of 2023, Diary No. 7292 of 2023, Diary No. 7350 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 8769 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 8765 of 2016, SLP(C) No. 22259 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 24080 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 22688 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 11164 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 22340 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 18 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 21758 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 14776 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 12692 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 14777 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 6519 of 2020, Diary No. 22560 of 2020, Diary No. 53 of 2021, Diary No. 26807 of 2021, Diary No. 28547 of 2021, Diary No. 29668 of 2021, Diary No. 30377 of 2021, SLP(C) No. 14200 of 2022, Diary No. 20986 of 2022, Diary No. 28053 of 2022, Diary No. 28449 of 2022, Diary No. 3365 of 2023, Diary No. 7291 of 2023, Diary No. 10704 of 2023, M.A. Diary

Digital Supreme Court Reports

No. 12526 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8703 of 2016, Diary No. 8526 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 20204 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 29831 of 2018, SLP(C) No. 4400 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 22033 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 702 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 3420 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 3989 of 2020, Diary No. 45825 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 3991 of 2020, Diary No. 46004 of 2019, SLP(C) No. 14870 of 2020, Diary No. 57 of 2020, Diary No.28141 of 2021, Diary No. 3172 of 2022, Diary No. 4265 of 2023, Diary No. 5017 of 2023, Diary No. 13554 of 2023, Diary No. 14069 of 2023, Diary No. 15816 of 2023, Diary No. 35480 of 2023, Diary No. 35488 of 2023, Diary No.7188 of 2018, Diary No. 34804 of 2023, Diary No. 13552 of 2023, Diary No.38406 of 2023, Diary No. 40386 of 2023, Diary No. 28110 of 2021, SLP(C) No.16233 of 2018, SLP(C) No.10946 of 2019, SLP(C) No.3407 of 2020, Diary No.13368 of 2023, Diary No.14006 of 2023, SLP(C) No.7909 of 2023, Diary No.6123 of 2023, SLP(C) No.10384 of 2019, SLP(C) No.10948 of 2019, Diary No.4531 of 2023, SLP(C) No.1928 of 2020, SLP(C) No.28645 of 2019, Diary No.46016 of 2019, SLP(C) No.6029 of 2020, Diary No.41008 of 2023, Diary No.41349 of 2023, Diary No.17929 of 2022, Diary No.14745 of 2023, Diary No.39704 of 2023, Diary No.3760 of 2022, Diary No.37530 of 2023, Diary No.38004 of 2023, Diary No.38009 of 2023, Diary No.38633 of 2023, Diary No.40192 of 2023, Diary No.21006 of 2022, Diary No.39771 of 2023, Diary No.36156 of 2023, Diary No.38635 of 2023, Diary No.38874 of 2023, Diary No.39775 of 2023, Diary No.41675 of 2023, SLP(C) No. 815 of 2020, SLP(C) No. 13889 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 13933 of 2022, SLP(C) No. 13774 of 2022, M.A. Diary No. 5141 of 2023 In R.P.(C) No. 385 of 2017, M.A. Diary No. 5463 of 2023 In Diary No. 10069 of 2021, M.A. Diary No. 6510 of 2023 In Diary No. 29149 of 2021, M.A. Diary No. 6515 of 2023 In Diary No. 20488 of 2019, M.A. Diary No. 9591 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8515 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 10339 of 2023 In Diary No. 20913 of 2021, M.A. Diary No. 10553 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8519 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 12548 of 2023 In Diary No. 5670 of 2022, M.A. Diary No. 12549 of 2023 In C.A. No. 9600 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 13254 of 2023 In Diary No. 20588 of 2019, M.A. Diary No. 21716 of 2023 In Diary No. 14110 of 2021, M.A. Diary No. 21786 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8648 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 27415 of 2023 In C.A. No. 1616 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 31028 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8555 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 33298 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8697 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 34776 of 2023 In Diary No. 41760 of 2018, M.A. Diary No. 34835 of 2023

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

In C.A. No. 8624 of 2016, Diary No.35093 of 2023, M.A. Diary No. 37258 of 2023 In C.A. No. 8632 of 2016, M.A. Diary No. 38181 of 2023, Diary No.27769 of 2022 AND M.A. No.1919 of 2023 In C.A. No.397 of 2023

Appearances for Parties

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, K.M. Nataraj, Vikramjeet Banerjee, A.S.Gs., Kailash Vasdev, Sanjay Poddar, Sanjeev Sen, Ms. Rachna Shrivastva, Ravinder Sethi, Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sanjay Parikh, Jayant Mehta, Neeraj Kumar Jain, Manan Kumar Mishra, K. Ramakanth Reddy, P.N. Mishra, U.K. Uniyal, Ravindra Kumar, Gopal Shankarnarayanan, Dhruv Mehta, Vikas Singh, Sanjiv Sen, Ms. Vibha Dutta Makhija, Jayant Bhushan, Ms. Geeta Luthra, Sajiv Sen, Sr. Advs., Ms. Sujeeta Srivastava, Ms. Poornima Singh, Rustam Singh Chauhan, Ms. BLN Shivani, Ms. Manisha Chava, Vinayak Sharma, Sanjay Kr. Tyagi, Anil Hooda, Siddhanth Kohli, T.S. Sabarish, Ms. Preeti Rani, Rajan Kr. Chourasia, Shailesh Madiyal, Sharath Nambiar, Anuj Srinivas Udupa, Vatsal Joshi, Ms. Indira Bhakar, Yogya Rajpurohit, Nitin Mishra, Ishaan Sharma, Ms. Mitali Gupta, Ms. Shambhavi Sharma, Govind Kumar, Ms. Shagun Sabharwal, Ms. Anjali Singh, Ms. Radha Gupta, Mrs. Sikha Sharma, Mohan Lal Sharma, Atul Kumar, Ms. Sweety Singh, Avs Kadyan, Ms. Archana Kumari, N Balraj, Rahul Pandey, Ms. Rachita Kadyan, Dr. M.P. Raju, Dr. P. George Giri, Ms. Mary Scaria, Ms. Jasmin Kurian Giri, Shaji Sebastian, Ginesh P, Maneesh Narayanan, Abhay Singh, P. George Giri, Ms. Binu Tamta, Ms. Shalini Chandra, Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Ravinder Kumar Yadav, Vinay Mohan Sharma, Ms. Arti Anupriya, Vineet Yadav, Kartikey, Paras Juneja, Ms. Akshi Kaushal, Amir Yadav, M/s. Saharya & Co., Shashank Singh, Nishit Agrawal, Abhinav Mukerji, Chandra Prakash, Vivek Singh, C.P. Rajwar, Ms. Somi Sharma, Vinay Jangra, Ramesh Kumar, Vikrant Narayan Vasudeva, Sarthak Chiller, Rohit Singh, Rohit Lochav, Ajay Marwah, Nitin Jain, Dr. P.B. Reddy, Ms. Patnam Shayla, Ms. C.S. Hema, Chand Qureshi, Ashwani Kumar, Ms. Arti Singh, Ms. Manika Tripathy, Ashutosh Kaushik, Ishan Sharma, Rony John, Ms. Aastha Agnihotri, Chandra Prakash Tiwari, Aishwary Jaiswal, Ms. Shashi Kiran, Satish Chandra, Arjun Sain, Ms. Sangeeta Bhalla, Ms. Prachi Bajpai, Ms. Epsita Agastya, Praveen Swarup, Ms. Payal Swarup, Devesh Tripathi, M. Dubey, Ameet Siingh, Devesh Maurya, Pratham Sethi, Rajatdeep Sharma, Ravi Kumar, Ms. Pratishtha Majumdar, Ravi Bharuka,

Digital Supreme Court Reports

Bijender Singh, Puneet Sharma, Jagjit Singh Chhabra, Ms. Yoothica Pallavi, Ms. Niharika Ahluwalia, Arpit Sharma, Himagn Jain, Mohd. Amanullah, Azhar Ali, Misbah Bin Tariq, Ms. Shabeena Anjum, Shaheen Alvi, Nishu Khan, Saurabh Mishra, Keshav Sehgal, Ms. Malvika Kapila, Ms. Tanwangi Shukla, Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, Sandeep Devashish Das, Ms. Sunieta Ojha, Ms. Astha Tyagi, Mahesh Kumar, Ms. Trisha Chandran, Mrs. Priyanka Mayer, Aman Preet Singh Rahi, Nikhilesh Kumar, Ms. Devika Khanna, Mrs. V D Khanna, VMZ Chambers, N.S. Vasisht, Ms. Jyoti Kataria, Ms. Anu Gupta, Irshad Ahmad, Shaik Mohd. Haneef, M. Khairati, Anuj Jain, Mukesh Verma, Pankaj Kumar Singh, Yash Pal Dhingra, Ashish Virmani, Prem Malhotra, Karun Sharma, Bharat Arora, Ms. Charu Ambwani, Rishi Raj Sharma, Ms. Shruti Agrawal, Abhinav Ramkrishna, Ms. Samina Thakur, Ms. Anjali Chauhan, Ms. Chandni V Shah, G C Shukla, Vineet Singh, Darshan Chandrakant Siddarkar, Vijay Singh, Saroj Kumar Sinha, Narendra Kumar Goyal, Ms. Kajal Rani, Ms. Komal Singh, Subhod, Suresh Prasad, Shrivandit Mishra, Suraj, Anshuman Srivastava, Dinesh Kumar Garg, M/s. Anuradha & Associates, Neeraj Kumar Verma, Akhilesh Kumar Singh, Ritesh Kumar, Mrs. Balvinder Kaur Brar, Saurabh Upadhyay, Ms. Hardika, Ms. Tanishi J., Ms. Sanya Narula, Dr. S. K. Verma, Gopal Jha, N. Prabhakar, Joydip Roy, Shreyash Bharadwaj, Umesh Kumar Yadav, Sudhansu Palo, Mrs. Ipsita Behura, R. K. Mishra, Budhadeva Palo, Sanjay Kumar Mishra, Ms. Dikhaya Goswami, Ms. Awantika Manohar, Davesb Bhatia, Sadre Alam, Shekhar Kumar, Vijay Kumar, Ms. Jasmine Damkewala, Love Kumar Gupta, Ashvin Raj Jaiswal, Soayib Qureshi, Rajesh Gupta, Harpreet Singh, Puneet Taneja, Mool Chand Verma, Ms. Smita Maan, R. C. Kaushik, Rakesh Kumar-i, Ms. N. Annapoorani, Abhay Kumar, Shagun Ruhil, Ms. Kusum Pandey, Ms. Anamika, Ankit Jain, Sanjay Singh, Umang Shankar, Siddharth Jain, Vidyut K., Bhagwat Pershad Gupta, Surender Kumar Gupta, Ms. Richa Kapoor, Ms. Tusharika Sharma, Shisham Pradhan, Sumit Bansal, N.S. Vashisht, Gagan Gupta, Udaibir Kochar, Ms. Setu N., Ms. Esha Mazumdar, Ishan Singh, Ms. Isha Ray, Ms. Priyanjali Singh, Harish Pandey, Jaideep Malik, Rajesh Kumar Chaurasia, Hem Kumar, Anurag Jain, Mrs. Soni, Ranjeet Kumar, Bitu Kumar Singh, Charudatta Vijayrao Mahindrakar, Gaurav M. Liberhan, Arun Singh Rawat, Ms. Mukti Chowdhary, Manish Kaushik, Anubhav, Keshav Kumar, Shubham Singh, Ms. Shipra Ghose, Sudhir Naagar, B.P Gupta, Digvijay Chaudhary, Mohit Singh, Roop Chaudhary, Agrim

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

Arora, Ms. Apeksha Mehta, Ms. Neha Choudhary, Ms. Falguni Gupta, Ms. Umang Motiyani, Ms. Charanya Lakshmikumaran, Siddhartha Iyer, Puneet Singh Bindra, Ms. Simran Jeet, Akshay Sharma, Rishabh Gupta, Sameer Sethi, Ajay Kumar Singh, Shirish K. Deshpande, Ms. Akhila Wali, Ms. Rucha Pravin Mandlik, Ms. Harsimran Kaur Rai, Mohit Gautam, Apoorv Sharma, Y K Kapur, Bhushan Kapur, Amrendra Kumar Mehta, Mrs. Lalita Kaushik, Rajender Pd. Saxena, Rajendra Prasad Saxena, N.P. Sahni, Vineet Sinha, Avdhesh Kumar Singh, B.S. Chaudhary, Ms. Ritu Rastogi, Akshat Mahajan, Rajendra Kumar Singh, Ms. Suvarna Singh, Ms. Preety Kumari, Sanjay Kumar Visen, Vijay Kasana, Mohit Mathur, Ashish Tanwar, Kshitij Chhabra, Chirag Verma, Mrs. Chetna Singh, Ashutosh Srivastava, Ms. Komal Agrawal, Ms. Kavya Vijay, Umesh Chandra Srivastava, Rajeev Singh, Kaushik Poddar, Kunal Verma, Abhishek Atrey, M.K. Sharma, Abhinav Sharma, Ms. Vishakha Sharam, Mohan Singh, Ms. Rajkumari Banju, Ms. E. R. Sumathy, Manish Kumar, Amit Kumar, Piyush Kaushik, M P Bhargava, Ms. Aparajita Jha, Aashu Tyagi, Madan Sagar, Varun Kapur, Mohit Kr. Sharma, Abinash Kumar Mishra, D.K. Garg, Dhananjay Garg, Abhishek Garg, Ishaan Tiwari, R.P. Bansal, Sibo Sankar Mishra, Sanchit Garga, Manish K. Bishnoi, Hitesh Lodwal, Atishi Dipankar, K. S. Rana, Vipin Kumar Jai, Mahesh Thakur, Shivamm Sharrma, Ms. Anusha R, Mrs. Geetanjali Bedi, Ranvijay Singh Chandel, Rajiv Ranjan Dwivedi, Ankit Anandraj Shah, T. L. Garg, Ranjit Kumar Sharma, Divyanshu Goyal, Mayank Kapoor, Ms. Divya Sharma, Abhay Kumar Tayal, Nishant Prateek, Syed Mehdi Imam, D K Sharma, Ankur Sharma, Raghav Bhatia, Raghav Bhaitia, M/s. Vedyia Partners, Rajiv Raheja, Anuj Bhandari, Mrs. Anju Jain, Hitesh Sachaar, Dharamraj Ohlan, Ms. Charu Nagpal, Krishan Kant Kaushik, Chirag Singhal, Mukesh Kumar, Vishwa Pal Singh, Atul Jain, Ankit Kumar, Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, Amit Pawan, Arjun Singh Bhati, Gurdeep Singh, Binay Kumar Das, Ms. Priyanka Das, Ms. Neha Das, Ravi Shankar Ravi, Manish Paliwal, Ms. Megha Yadav, Udaibir Singh Kochar, Shankar Prasad Tanti, Baij Nath Yadav, Nischal Kumar Neeraj, Mayank B., Naveen Chawla, Rishabh Kr. T., Ms. Surabhi Rana, T. Mahipal, Siddharth Batra, Chinmay Dubey, Ms. Archana Yadav, Ms. Shivani Chawla, Rhythm Katyal, Ashutosh Chugh, Pratyush Arora, Sandeep Jindal, Om Prakash Vyas, Sandeep Kumar Dwivedi, Krrish Gupta, Pradeep Kumar Dwivedi, Ms. Prerana Chaturvedi, Sachin Kumar Sharma, Anil Kumar, Anuj Singh Rana, Nakul Awana, Vinay K. Shailendera, Ms. Worthing Kasar, Saksham

Digital Supreme Court Reports

Maheshwari, B S Mathur, Rajat Mathur, Akbar Siddique, Ms. Ananya Luthra, Parwez Akhtar, S.K. Sinha, Shankar Divate, L B Rai, Arun Upadhyay, Kartik Rai, Rajivkumar, Sanjeev Gupta, Pradeep Dweivedi, Kamal Katyan, Ms. Sapna Nirwan, R. C. Kohli, Azim H. Laskar, Raish Khan, Rajiv Narain, Bikas Kar Gupta, Yash Narain, Chandra Bhushan Prasad, Yashraj Singh Deora, Harpreet Singh, Sumit R. Sharma, D. S. Mahra, Arvind Kumar Gupta, Mohit Chaudhary, Ms. Puja Sharma, Kunal Sachdeva, Ms. Madhuri Jain, Chowdhary Zulfikar Ali, Balwinder Singh Suri, Prakhar Mittal, Ms. Srishti Bajpai, Ms. S. Arya, M/s. Kings And Alliance LLP, Zulfiqar Ali Khan, H.R. Khan, Amar Gupta, Divyam Agarwal, Zain Maqbool, Ms. Neelam Singh, Neeraj Shekhar, Dr. Sumit Kumar, P.R. Rajhans, Abhishek Pandey, Chandra Pratap, Karan Tomar, Debesh Panda, Fauzia Shakil, Devesh Pratap Singh, Bharat Bhushan, Anand Varma, Devansh Malhotra, Vishal Sinha, Sumit Goel, Jayant Bajaj, M/s. Parekh & Co., Sundeep Shrivastava, Paran Kumar, Braj Kishore Mishra, Abhishek Yadav, Ruchit Mohan, Pankaj Talwar, Vaibhav Agarwal, Dharamveer Singh, Amit Kumar Sinha, Syed Kashan Ali, Sriram Kamal, Mrs. Shikha Bhargava, Aditya Prasad, Dr. Ram Kishore Chaudhary, Sunil Ahaya, Mrs. Rakhi Banerjee, Raj Kumar Yadav, Chandan Kumar Mandal, Mahesh Agarwal, Ankur Saigal, Ms. S. Lakshmi Iyer, Ms. Anwesha Padhi, Ms. Kamakshi Sehgal, Ms. Abha Saigal, E. C. Agrawala, Sanchar Anand, Aman Kumar Thakur, Karan Thakur, Arjun Rana, Vivek Mishra, Ms. Sumbul Ausaf, Devendra Singh, Vishnu Shankar Jain, Ms. Sushma Suri, M. Hashim Miyan, R. B. Singh, Mohit Kumar Gupta, Mukesh Kumar Verma, Vikas Gupta, Vivek Gupta, Ms. Vuzmal Nehru, M. C. Dhingra, Udai Bir Kochar, Mrs. Madhavi Yadav, Ms. Prashi Tyagi, Vikrant Yadav, Manoj C. Mishra, Ankur Mahindro, Rohan Taneja, Soumil Gonsalves, Ankush Satija, Aditya Kapur, Mehul Jain, Rohit Bishnoi, Ms. Vaishali, Ms. Prerna Bhardwaj, Ms. Sugandha Anand, Keith Varghese, Ms. Sonal K Chopra, M/s. Mitter & Mitter Co., B. Krishna Prasad, T.V.S. Raghavendra Sreyas, Bhagwat Parshad Gupta, Ms. Ranjeeta Rohatgi, Ms. Shrika Gautam, B.V. Niren, Rakesh Kumar, Hiren Dasan, Ajit Sharma, Bankey Bihari, Vikas Kumar, Varun Singh, Ms. Kajal S Gupta, Aman Panwar, Akash Panwar, Ms. Somesa Gupta, Ms. Deepika Kalia, Mudit Gupta, Ms. Deepeika Kalia, Ms. Vaishnavi, Keshav Khandelwal, Tushar Bakshi, Sanjay Jain, Mukesh K. Giri, Aftab Rasheed, Ashraf Mansoorie, Aftab Ali Khan, Nitish Kant Sharma, Vineet Gupta, Vikramaditya Singh, Md. Shahid Anwar, Syed Rehan, Mohd. Shahzeb Khan, Ms. S.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

Janani, Ms. Sharika Rai, Jasbir Singh Malik, Ms. Chandni Sharma, Ms. Divya Mishra, Varun Punia, Mohit D. Ram, Naresh Kumar, Pankaj Bhagat, Gaurav Jain, Ms. Abha Jain, Narendra Kumar Jain, Jaivir Singh, Aniteja Sharma, Ms. Jaikriti S. Jadeja, Mrs. B. Sunita Rao, Ms. Harsh Lata, B. S. Nagar, Prakash Gautam, Rohtas Nagar, Shobhit Jain, Rahul Sharma, Vinam Gupta, Amrish Kumar, Sidhant Kohli, S.K Tyagi, Jitendra Hooda, Shafik Ahmed, Sunny, Ajay Sharma, Sachin Wadhwa, T S Sabarish, Mrs. Preeti Rani, S.K. Rout, Omkar Prasad, Ganesh Singh, Shivang Singh, Prithvi Pal, D S Kauntae, Dr. N. Pradeep Sharma, Priyonkoo Anjan Gogoi, Amit Acharya, Ms. Mridula Ray Bharadwaj, Ms. Asha Jain Madan, Mukesh Jain, Sanjay Jha, Shibashish Misra, Vikas Mehta, Ms. Priyambada Mishra, Adith Nair, Ms. Rashmi Rampal, Shekhar Prit Jha, Ms. Firdouse Qutb Wani, Ashwani Bhardwaj, Ajay Vikram Singh, Mrs. Priyanka Singh, Pankaj Kumar, Omkar, Neeraj Kumar Sharma, Ms. Supriya Juneja, Ms. Deepali, Ms. Palak Bagchi, Amit Gupta, Abhimanyu Sharma, Tarun Gupta, Tejas Patel, Ms. Muskaan Gandhi, Ms. Ritika Saini, Aditya Kumar Tripathi, Pawan Aneja, Sanjay Sharawat, Digvijay Rai, Ashok Kumar, Ms. Shivani Luthra Lohiya, Mukul Kumar, Krishan Kumar, Mrs. Neetu Sharma, Nitin Pal, Shivam Pandey Ms. Rukhmini Bobde, Ashok Panigrahi, Prashant Singh I, Baby Devi Bonia, Prashant Rawat, B K Satija, Santosh Kumar, Ms. Aakanksha Kaul, Pratyush Shrivastava, Nachiketa Joshi, Kanu Agarwal, Akshay Amritanshu, Sakshi Kakkar, Saransh Kumar, Rajan Kumar Chourasia, Ms. Shruti Agarwal, Adit Khorana, Abhishek Singh, Shashank Bajpai, Annirudh Sharma li, Raghav Sharma, Sachin Sharma, Shiv Mangal Sharma, Digvijay Dam, Veer Vikrant Singh, Ayush Anand, Bhuvan Kapoor, Ms. Shivika Mehra, G S Makkar, Shubhendu Anand, Prashant Singh II, Rajeev Ranjan, Tacho Eru, A K Kaul, Navanjay Mahapatra, Raman Yadav, Chitransh Sharma, Rajesh K. Singh, Arvind Kumar Sharma, Aman Varma, Parijat Kishore, Mishra Saurabh, Nishit Agrawal, Sanjeev Sagar, Shekhar Raj Sharma, Ms. Akshaya Jebakumar, Jinendra Jain, Rahul Shyam Bhandari, Chirag M. Shroff, Gaurav Dhingra, Miss Meera Kaura, Abhinav Chandan, Abhimanyu Bhandari, Ms. Rooh-e-hina Dua, Harshit Khanduja, Ms. Dhanakshi Gandhi, Ms. Pallavi Pratap, M. A. Chinnasamy, M.K. Maroria, Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Ms. Swarupama Chaturvedi, Ms. Sonali Jain, Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, Gurmeet Singh Makker, Ms. Kaveeta Wadia, S. Nagarajan, Yasharth Kant, Pardeep Gupta, Parinav Gupta, Mrs. Mansi Gupta, Dr. Mrs. Vipin Gupta, Mrs. Mamta Sharma, Alok

Digital Supreme Court Reports

Sangwan, Sumit Kumar Sharma, Ms. Shehla Chaudhary, Md. Anas Chaudhary, Rajat Sangwan, Vaibhav Yadav, Ansar Ahmad Chaudhary, N. S. Chechi, Ms. Rekha Chauhan, Rajiv Dewan, Ms. Puja Dewan, Ms. Jyoti Mendiratta, Gautam Narayan, Ashok Kumar Jain, Pankaj Jain, Meenakshi Jain, Bijoy Kumar Jain, Alok Tripathi, Suhaas Ratna Joshi, Satish Kumar, Randhir Singh, Ms. Manjeet Chawla, Mrs. Usha Pant Kukreti, Siddhant Asthana, Ms. Neha Malik, Abhith Kumar, Shaym Sharma, Sanjeev Baliyan, Dilraj Singh Bhinder, Binish Kumar, Sujoy Chatterjee, G.C. Shukla, Mukesh Kumar Singh, Onkar Prasad, D.S. Chauhan, Upendra Pratap Singh, Advs. for the appearing parties.

Judgment / Order of the Supreme Court

Judgment

Surya Kant, J.

Table of contents*

A. Facts	64
B. Contentions of parties	72
C. Law on Condonation of Delay	78
D. Whether delay should be condoned in the present cases?	82
D.1. Suppression of facts by the landowners	82
D.2. Change of law	85
D.3. Leeway to be granted to government entities	91
D.4. COVID-19 Pandemic	94
D.5. Supreme Court frowning upon the filing of fresh SLPs	97
D.6. Public interest and justice	98
D.7. Delay already condoned in some cases	102
E. Conclusion and Directions	104
Appendix	114
List A: Suppression of facts	116
List B: Notice neither on delay nor on merits	120
List C: Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications	129
List D: Leave granted in previous SLP	131
List E: Leave not granted in previous SLP	134

* Ed. Note: Pagination as per the original Judgment.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

For the reasons assigned in Part E of this Judgement, we grant leave in all these Special Leave Petitions, except those mentioned in ‘List-B’, ‘List-D.2’ and ‘List-E.1’ (*infra*).

2. These appeals have been preferred by the Delhi Development Authority (DDA), Government of National Capital of Delhi (GNCTD), Land Acquisition Collector (LAC), Delhi State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation (DSIIDC), East Delhi Municipal Corporation, and Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. (DMRC) (collectively, the “appellants”), against various identical orders of the High Court of Delhi, whereby acquisition proceedings had been declared to have lapsed in terms of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter, the “2013 Act”). Multiple Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications have also been moved by the DDA seeking recall and review of certain orders of this Court dismissing their SLPs, whereby some of the land acquisition proceedings were declared to have lapsed.
3. While the factual matrix giving rise to the present controversy has been elaborated in a judgement of the even date passed by us in the matter of **GNCTD (through Secretary, Land and Building Dept.) v. KL Rath Steel Ltd.**,¹ a very brief overview of the relevant facts has been set out below.

A. Facts

- 3.1. The GNCTD initiated the land acquisition process under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter, “1894 Act”) for the planned development of Delhi. The beneficiaries of such acquisition process were various state entities such as DDA, DSIIDC, and DMRC, who needed the lands for different projects like residential schemes, industrial areas, flyovers, the Delhi Metro, etc. Accordingly, over a long span of 1957-2006, various notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the 1894 Act were issued for acquiring these lands and awards were passed under Section 11 of the 1894 Act affixing compensation.
- 3.2. In some cases, the compensation amount was deposited in the treasury since the landowners did not come forward to

1 MA No. 414/2023.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

receive the same. Similarly, possession could not be taken in some cases as the affected landowners had challenged the acquisition proceedings and had obtained an order of stay in their favour.

- 3.3. In the meanwhile, the 2013 Act was enacted by the Parliament, thereby repealing the 1894 Act. This new legislation brought about various reforms to the land acquisition process. Importantly, Section 24 of the 2013 Act provided that land acquisition proceedings initiated under the earlier regime would be deemed to have lapsed in certain cases, including when compensation had not been paid or possession had not been taken. The provision reads as follows:

“(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, in any case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (1 of 1894), —

(a) where no award under Section 11 of the said Land Acquisition Act has been made, then, all provisions of this Act relating to the determination of compensation shall apply; or

(b) where an award under said Section 11 has been made, then such proceedings shall continue under the provisions of the said Land Acquisition Act, as if the said Act has not been repealed.

*(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), in case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, **where an award under the said Section 11 has been made five years or more prior to the commencement of this Act but the physical possession of the land has not been taken or the compensation has not been paid the said proceedings shall be deemed to have lapsed** and the appropriate Government, if it so chooses, shall initiate the proceedings of such land acquisition afresh in accordance with the provisions of this Act.*

Provided that where an award has been made and compensation in respect of a majority of land

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

holdings has not been deposited in the account of the beneficiaries, then, all beneficiaries specified in the notification for acquisition under Section 4 of the said Land Acquisition Act, shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act”

[emphasis supplied]

- 3.4. One of the first cases interpreting Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act was [Pune Municipal Corporation v. Harak Chand Mistrimal Solanki](#),² in which a three-judge bench of this Court held that offering payment to the landowner and depositing it with the Reference Court in case of certain contingencies under Section 31(2) of the 1894 Act, would fulfil the requirement of the compensation being “paid”.³ Accordingly, depositing compensation with the Government Treasury was held to not constitute payment of compensation for purposes of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act and such land acquisition proceedings were held to have lapsed.
- 3.5. In a subsequent judgment of [Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu](#),⁴ a two-judge bench of this Court further elucidated the concept of taking possession by holding that the period during which an order of stay is in operation is not excluded by Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act. Consequently, this Court held that an operation of stay would not ameliorate a failure to take possession and that such acquisition proceedings would be deemed to have lapsed.
- 3.6. Relying on these two decisions, the present respondent-landowners approached the High Court from 2014 to 2017 seeking declaration(s) that the acquisition proceedings initiated by GNCTD had lapsed because of non-payment of compensation or non-taking of possession. Following the dictum in [Pune Municipal Corporation \(supra\)](#) and [Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association \(supra\)](#), the High Court allowed the landowners’ claim and declared the acquisition proceedings as

2 [\[2014\] 1 SCR 783](#) : (2014) 3 SCC 183, para 17.

3 The contingencies being, when landowners do not give consent to receive compensation, there is no person competent to alienate the land, or there is dispute regarding title to receive the compensation.

4 [\[2014\] 7 SCR 799](#) : (2015) 3 SCC 353, para 11.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

lapsed. The appellants preferred SLPs against some of these orders, many of which were in turn dismissed by this Court either *in limine* or after granting leave.

- 3.7. However, a two-judge bench of this Court in ***Yogesh Neema v. State of Madhya Pradesh***⁵ doubted the correctness of ***Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association (supra)***. Relying upon the maxim “*actus curiae neminem gravabit*” (i.e., the act of court should not prejudice the parties), the bench referred for reconsideration the question of law regarding the effect of an order of stay on possession under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act to a larger bench.
- 3.8. Similarly, another two-judge bench of this Court in ***Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra***⁶ doubted the correctness of ***Pune Municipal Corporation (supra)*** and referred the question of law regarding the manner of payment under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act for reconsideration.
- 3.9. Both these issues were considered by a three-judge bench of this Court in ***Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra***.⁷ The larger bench held, *inter alia*, that the term “paid” in Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act is to be read as “tender” of payment, i.e., an offer to pay. In case the compensation was tendered and the same was refused, it was to be interpreted as “paid”. Further, on account of various rules made under Section 55 of the 1894 Act, it was held that the term “deposit” in the proviso to Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act must be read to include a deposit of compensation with the Government Treasury, and not just with the Reference Court. The three-judge bench then held that ***Pune Municipal Corporation (supra)*** was *per incuriam* as it failed to consider the statutory rules made under Section 55 of the 1894 Act and as it also did not take notice of appropriate precedents for interpreting the term “paid”. ***Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association (supra)*** was also overruled in so far as it allowed landowners to unduly benefit from orders of stay.

5 (2016) 6 SCC 387, para 6-7.

6 (2018) 1 SCC 733, para 23.

7 [2018] 2 SCR 1 : (2018) 3 SCC 412, para 216-217.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

- 3.10. It is in the aftermath of *Shailendra (supra)* that the appellants filed most of the present appeals, Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications seeking a favourable determination of their rights.
- 3.11. Meanwhile, in *State of Haryana v. GD Goenka Tourism Corporation Ltd.*,⁸ it was argued that since *Pune Municipal Corporation (supra)* and *Shailendra (supra)* were decided by a bench of equal strength, the matter should be referred to a larger bench. This Court deferred the hearing to a later date and held that pending a final decision on referring the matter to a larger Bench, the High Courts shall not deal with any case relating to the interpretation of Section 24 of the 2013 Act. Subsequently, two different benches of this Court issued even date orders on 22.02.2018 in *Indore Development Authority v. Shyam Verma*⁹ and *State of Haryana v. Maharana Pratap Charitable Trust (Regd.)*,¹⁰ referring the matter to a larger bench.
- 3.12. Eventually, a five-judge bench decided these questions of law in *Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal*¹¹ and held, *inter alia*, that the term “or” in Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act shall be read as “and”, such that for land acquisition proceedings to lapse under this Section, neither the compensation must have been paid nor the possession must have been taken. With respect to payment of compensation, it was held that the term “paid” means tendering of payment and the term “deposit” in Section 24 of the 2013 Act includes deposit both with the government treasury and the Reference Court. Hence, land acquisition proceedings cannot be deemed to have lapsed if compensation was tendered to the landowner and later deposited in the Treasury. With respect to possession, the Constitution Bench held that the period of stay granted in favour of landowners ought to be excluded. Consequently, *Pune Municipal Corporation (supra)* and *Sree Balaji*

8 (2018) 3 SCC 585, para 9.

9 (2020) 15 SCC 342, para 3.

10 (2018) SCC Online SC 3600, para 1.

11 [2020] 3 SCR 1 : (2020) 8 SCC 129, para 366.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

Nagar Residential Association (*supra*) were overruled. This Court also overruled *Shailendra* (*supra*), since the question of reading the conditions under Section 24(2) conjunctively (i.e., reading “or” as ‘and’) was not considered by that case. Subsequently, in light of the decision in *Manoharlal* (*supra*), the judgment in *Pune Municipal Corporation* (*supra*) was recalled.

- 3.13. After the dust stood settled finally in *Manoharlal* (*supra*), the appellants filed another batch of appeals against such orders of the High Court of Delhi which had relied on *Pune Municipal Corporation* (*supra*) and *Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association* (*supra*) to declare the acquisition proceedings as having lapsed. Similarly, Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications were filed against the orders of this Court dismissing the SLPs filed previously.
- 3.14. To simplify, the present batch of matters before us can broadly be classified into the following three categories:
- (a) *First*, cases filed before *Shailendra* (*supra*). Most of the SLPs in this category were dismissed by this Court after granting leave, on the strength of *Pune Municipal Corporation* (*supra*) and *Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association* (*supra*), but a few were deferred to a later date and are still pending;
 - (b) *Second*, cases filed after *Shailendra* (*supra*), on the ground that *Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association* (*supra*) has been overruled and *Pune Municipal Corporation* (*supra*) has been held to be *per incuriam*; and
 - (c) *Third*, cases filed after *Manoharlal* (*supra*) which overruled both *Pune Municipal Corporation* (*supra*) and *Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association* (*supra*), with a plea that the High Court decisions deserve to be revisited given the principles enunciated in *Manoharlal* (*supra*).
- 3.15. We note that a factor common to most of the matters mentioned in paragraph 3.14 above is that they were filed after the expiration of the period of limitation. The quantum of delay differs in each case, and while it is less in the cases filed in

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

the first category, it is significantly long in the second and third categories. Hence, at this stage, it is important to first examine at length the prayer for condonation of delay and the maintainability of these petitions, before delving into the merits of each case.

B. Contentions of parties

4. The appellants were represented by Ld. Attorney General for India, Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, Ld. Additional Solicitor General, and Senior Advocates, including Ms. Rachna Srivastava, Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Mr. Sanjib Sen, and Mr. Kailash Vasdev. From the side of Respondents, we were assisted by an array of Senior Advocates, including Mr. Dhruv Mehta, Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Mr. Jayant Bhushan, Mr. Jayant Mehta, Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija, and Mr. Vikas Singh, and Ms. Bansuri Swaraj, Advocate.
5. The appellants argued that they had sufficient cause for not filing the appeals and applications within the prescribed time. Substantiating this, they made the following submissions:
 - (a) The respondent-landowners had suppressed certain material facts from the High Court. Once the appellants discovered these fraudulent claims, they filed the present appeals. In ***Commissioner of Customs v. Candid Enterprises***,¹² this Court held that fraud vitiates the delay that occurred before its discovery. The discovery of the facts suppressed by the respondents before the High Court, gives rise to a fresh cause of action and, hence the period preceding the revelation of such fraud deserves to be excluded while calculating the limitation period.
 - (b) The appellants were disabled from filing appeals within the prescribed limitation period because the governing law during such period as laid down in ***Pune Municipal Corporation (supra)*** and ***Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association (supra)***, would have caused the dismissal of their petitions. Since the question of law was finally decided in their favour in ***Shailendra (supra)*** and ***Manoharlal (supra)***, their cause of action stood revived to enable them to approach this Court. Further, a case is applied retrospectively unless the judgment

12 (2002) 9 SCC 764, para 6.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

expressly recites otherwise, as held in [CIT v. Saurashtra Kutch Stock Exchange Ltd.](#)¹³ Since [Manoharlal \(supra\)](#) did not restrict its applicability prospectively, all the cases decided before thereto deserve to be re-decided based on the principles enunciated in it.

- (c) The Court should take a liberal approach regarding condonation of delay and allow leeway to the government authorities, who, on account of their impersonal character, multiple chains of approval, processing of a large number of files, and lack of resources, unintentionally cross the prescribed limitation timeline and suffer bureaucratic delay.
- (d) The delay caused by the COVID-19 pandemic deserves to be condoned as the restrictions on movement during the lockdown, defuncted the appellants who did not have a well-equipped technological infrastructure in place to meet such unexpected and newer challenges. The appellants in this regard placed reliance on various decisions of this Court including [Collector \(LA\), Anantnag v. Katiji](#),¹⁴ [G. Ramegowda v. Spl. Land Acquisition Officer](#),¹⁵ [State of Manipur v. Koting Lamkang](#),¹⁶ and [Sheo Raj Singh v. Union of India](#).¹⁷
- (e) The appellants could not file the appeals on time because the Court was frowning upon the filing of multiple fresh SLPs despite the law having been settled in [Pune Municipal Corporation \(supra\)](#), and was imposing costs while dismissing such SLPs.
- (f) In various cases such as [Imrat Lal v. LAC](#),¹⁸ this Court has held that delay can be condoned in the interest of justice. In the present case also, the Court should condone the delay in public interest and subserve the cause of justice as the acquisition proceedings were undertaken for projects of eminent public importance like the expansion of the metro, construction of flyovers, hospitals, etc.

¹³ [\[2008\] 13 SCR 421](#) : (2008) 14 SCC 171, para 35.

¹⁴ [\[1987\] 2 SCR 387](#) : (1987) 2 SCC 107, para 3.

¹⁵ [\[1988\] 3 SCR 198](#) : (1988) 2 SCC 142, para 17.

¹⁶ [\[2019\] 13 SCR 565](#) : (2019) 10 SCC 408, para 8.

¹⁷ [\[2023\] 13 SCR 743](#) : 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1278, para 11.

¹⁸ (2014) 14 SCC 133, para 11.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

6. *Per contra*, the respondent-land owners vociferously argued that the appellants have failed to showcase sufficient cause in filing the appeals and applications with enormous delay and that:
- (a) It is false to claim that the landowners had suppressed material facts during the proceedings in the High Court. Alternatively, even if some of the landowners did suppress the facts, these were only a handful of instances that could not be used for condoning delay in all the appeals and applications.
 - (b) Delay cannot be condoned based on subsequent change of law. If it were to be allowed as a legitimate ground for condonation of delay, no proceedings would ever reach finality because cases could be re-opened whenever a question of law were to be interpreted differently. Further, [*Shailendra \(supra\)*](#) and [*Manoharlal \(supra\)*](#) could not be applied retrospectively, since overruling of cases relying on [*Pune Municipal Corporation \(supra\)*](#) and [*Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association \(supra\)*](#) took away only their precedential effect and did not re-open the *lis* between the parties in those cases. The respondents have in this regard relied upon various decisions of this Court including [*Neelima Srivastava v. State of UP*](#)¹⁹ and [*Natural Resources Allocation, In re, Special Reference 1 of 2012*](#).²⁰
 - (c) There should be parity between private parties and government entities with respect to the yardstick to be applied for condonation of delay and no leeway should be granted to the latter (relied on, *inter alia*, [*Postmaster General v. Living Media India Ltd*](#))²¹.
 - (d) This Court has made it clear in [*Sagufa Ahmed v. Upper Assam Plywood Products \(P\) Ltd.*](#),²² that the relaxation on account of COVID-19 can be granted only in those cases where the limitation period expired during COVID-19. Such relaxation would not be available in the present case as the period of limitation for filing the appeals had expired much before the pandemic.

19 [\[2021\] 8 SCR 167](#) : 2021 SCC Online SC 610, para 29.

20 [\[2012\] 9 SCR 311](#) : (2012) 10 SCC 1, para 48.

21 [\[2012\] 1 SCR 1045](#) : (2012) 3 SCC 563, para 28.

22 [\[2020\] 9 SCR 472](#) : (2021) 2 SCC 317, para 17.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

- (e) Delay cannot be condoned on the grounds of the Court frowning upon the filing of fresh SLPs as no sufficient material to substantiate such a plea has been placed on record.
- (f) The grounds of public interest or cause of justice cannot be invoked to condone the delay, for even if the law of limitation produces a harsh outcome, it ought to be followed. The respondents have buttressed this plea by citing [Pundlik Jalam Patil v. Executive Engineer, Jalgaon Medium Project](#),²³ in which this Court held that delay cannot be condoned solely on the ground of public interest and to do justice because third-party rights may have been created during the prolonged delay and it would be unfair for such parties if the delay is condoned and the settled position is reversed.

C. Law on Condonation of Delay

7. Since the issue in this batch of appeals concerns the condonation of delay, it would be worthwhile to briefly allude to the law of limitation. The Limitation Act, 1963 ("Limitation Act") is a statute of repose founded on considerations of public policy and expediency. The dominant objective underlying the law of limitation is that the title to property, and matters of rights in general, cannot be kept in a state of constant uncertainty, doubt or suspense. Public interest requires that finality should be put to litigation. The Limitation Act, thus, prescribes the specific points of time from which the period of limitation begins to run for the institution of actions. On expiry of such period, no action can be initiated save and except where the court condones the delay for a sufficient cause. A party who is insensible to the value of civil remedies, and who does not assert his claim with promptitude is denied the ability to enforce even an otherwise rightful claim. This position is reflected in the Latin maxim, *vigilantibus et non dormientibus jura subveniunt*, i.e., the law aids the vigilant and not those who sleep on their rights.
8. The Bombay High Court in ***Kumudini Ramdas Shah v. K.M. Mody***²⁴ aptly expounded the philosophical pillars supporting the concept of limitation: (i) the sword of prosecution ought not to be hanging over an individual for an indeterminate period; (ii) those who have been

²³ [\[2008\] 15 SCR 135](#) : (2008) 17 SCC 448, para 30.

²⁴ *Kumudini Ramdas Shah v. K.M. Mody & Ors.*, AIR 1985 Bombay 320, para 4.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

lethargic in safeguarding their interests should not expect the law to come to their rescue; and (iii) a defendant ought not to suffer for lost evidence owing to the passage of time.

9. Section 3 of the Limitation Act reflects this philosophy. Every suit or appeal made after the period of limitation ought to be dismissed, notwithstanding whether such ground had been raised by the opposite side. However, this does not imply that the Limitation Act destroys the right itself. Instead, it only extinguishes the ability to enforce the right, without either creating or destroying the underlying cause of action or entitlement itself.
10. As is clear from a plain reading of Section 5 of the Limitation Act, there are exceptions to this general rule. The statute allows for admitting an action provided “sufficient cause” is shown. This vests courts with the discretion to extend the period of limitation if the applicant can show that he had sufficient cause for not preferring an appeal or application within the prescribed period. Section 5 requires analysis of two ingredients: *first*, an examination of whether “sufficient cause” has been made out; and *second*, whether such cause has been shown for not filing the appeal/application “within the prescribed period”.
11. As regards the first ingredient, the Limitation Act itself does not provide more guidance on what its constituent elements ought to be. Instead, Section 5 leaves the task of determining appropriate reasons for seeking condonation of delay to judicial interpretation and exercise of discretion upon the facts and individual circumstances of each case.
12. While there is no arithmetical formula, through decades of judicial application, certain yardsticks for judging the sufficiency of cause for condonation of delay have evolved. Mere good cause is not sufficient enough to turn back the clock and allow resuscitation of a claim otherwise barred by delay. The court ought to be cautious while undertaking such an exercise, being circumspect against condoning delay which is attributable to the applicant.²⁵ Although the actual period of delay might be instructive, it is the explanation for the delay which would be the decisive factor.²⁶

25 [Basawaraj v. Land Acquisition Officer](#) (2013) 14 SCC 81, para 9-11.

26 [Perumon Bhagvathy Devaswom v. Bhargavi Amma](#) (2008) 8 SCC 321, para 13.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

13. The court must also desist from throwing the baby out with the bathwater. A justice-oriented approach must be prioritized over technicalities,²⁷ as one motivation underlying such rules is to prevent parties from using dilatory tactics or abusing the judicial process. Pragmatism over pedanticism is therefore sometimes necessary – despite it appearing liberal or magnanimous. The expression ‘sufficient cause’ should be given liberal construction so as to advance substantial justice.²⁸
14. In addition to “sufficient cause”, Section 5 also requires that such cause must be shown within the prescribed period. To satisfy the latter condition, the applicant must show sufficient cause for not filing the appeal/application on the last day of the prescribed period and explain the delay made thereafter.²⁹ Causes arising after the culmination of the limitation period, despite being sufficient in substance, would not suffice for condonation given this second prong of Section 5 of the Limitation Act. However, the applicant shall not be required to prove each day’s delay till the date of filing such appeal/application.³⁰
15. With these broad yardsticks in mind, we shall now separately analyze each ground pleaded by the appellants on the anvil of sufficiency.

D. Whether delay should be condoned in the present cases?

D.1. Suppression of facts by the landowners

16. The appellants argued that the respondent-landowners had suppressed material facts from the High Court, including previous unsuccessful litigations. Acquisitions were in fact already complete in many of these cases, a fact that was deliberately not disclosed. Other respondent-landowners also concealed from the court how they were only subsequent purchasers who had acquired the lands after they had been notified for the acquisition. Similarly, in some cases, the landowners suppressed the fact that the acquired lands had already vested in their respective Gaon Sabhas.
17. In addition to highlighting the factum of suppression, the appellants have also demonstrated materiality. They urged that had these facts

27 [Raheem Shah v. Govind Singh](#), 2023 SCC OnLine SC 910, para 6.

28 [Sarpanch, Lonand Gram Panchayat v. Ramgiri Gasavi & Anr.](#), 1967 SCC OnLine SC 105, para 4.

29 [Ramlal v. Rewa Coalfields Ltd.](#), 1961 SCC OnLine SC 3, para 8.

30 [Ummer v. Pottengal Subida](#) (2018) 15 SCC 127, para 14.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

been disclosed before the High Court, the respondents would have been estopped from seeking the declaration that the acquisition proceedings had lapsed. The appellants have in this regard placed reliance on *Meera Sahni v. Lt. Governor of Delhi*³¹ and Section 3 of Delhi Lands (Restrictions on Transfer) Act, 1972, to fortify their contention that no *bona fide* sale transaction could take place in respect of the lands which were already the subject matter of acquisition process. These concealments, they submitted, amount to playing fraud on both the court and the public exchequer. Accordingly, the time spent in the discovery of such suppressions should be deducted from the overall quantum of delay.

18. In this regard, the appellants have cited Section 17 of the Limitation Act, which provides that:

“...the period of limitation shall not begin to run until the plaintiff or applicant has discovered the fraud or the mistake or could, with reasonable diligence, have discovered it, or in the case of a concealed document, until the plaintiff or the applicant first had the means of producing the concealed document or compelling its production.”

[emphasis supplied]

19. There can indeed be no quarrel that Section 17 of the Limitation Act is premised on the well-known principle that fraud vitiates the delay and provides a cause of action once discovered.³² The appellants’ contention, however, has to be evaluated keeping in view the stand taken on behalf of the respondent-landowners who have refuted the omnibus allegation of suppression of facts against all of them. We have already noticed in paragraph 6(a) above that according to the respondent-landowners there are only a few cases where the allegation of suppression of material facts merits consideration.
20. We may also hasten to clarify the scope of our enquiry. The respondent-landowners have not been called upon to refute or admit the allegations of concealment of facts attributed to some of them. Similarly, we have not asked the appellants to produce original records and documents to substantiate their allegation of concealment and

31 [\[2008\] 10 SCR 1012](#) : (2008) 9 SCC 177, para 21.

32 *Commissioner of Customs v. Candid Enterprises* (2002) 9 SCC 764, para 6.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

suppression of material facts. We are conscious that entering into an arena of factual controversy at such an advanced stage of litigation, and that too without giving adequate opportunities to the parties can be a potential threat to the cause of justice. Simultaneously, we are satisfied that the appellants' contention in this regard cannot be brushed aside lightly.

21. Without expressing any final definitive opinion on such allegations of concealment, we are of the considered view that the appellants have discharged a *prima facie* burden for the limited purpose of making out a case for condonation of delay in the cases mentioned in the appended 'List-A', which shall be read as a part of this judgment. We believe that a fact-finding exercise is necessary in these cases, and hence, there exist sufficient grounds for the condonation of delay. The nature of relief to be eventually granted after condoning the delay, will be separately dealt with in Part E of this order.

D.2. Change of law

22. Another ground taken by appellants for seeking condonation of delay is the subsequent change of law brought in by [Shailendra](#) (*supra*) and [Manoharlal](#) (*supra*). However, we are unable to agree with this contention because of four primary reasons.
23. *Firstly*, this ground seeks to use events temporally subsequent to the expiry of the limitation period to justify the delay. To revisit Section 5 of the Limitation Act, the text of the statute provides that an appeal or application may be admitted after the prescribed period if the "*appellant or the applicant satisfies the court that he had sufficient cause for not preferring the appeal or making the application within such period.*" Hence, the appellants are required to explain that they were diligent during the prescribed period of limitation and could not file the appeal because of a "sufficient cause" arising within the prescribed period.
24. This understanding is squarely covered by the case of [Ajit Singh Thakur v. State of Gujarat](#),³³ which had an analogous factual situation. The appellants in the cited case were accused of killing one Manilal and injuring Bhulabhai and others and were acquitted by the trial court. Against this, Bhulabhai filed a revision petition

33 [\[1981\] 2 SCR 509](#) : (1981) 1 SCC 495, para 6.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

before the High Court, which passed certain observations stating that it is a fit case for the State to file an appeal. Consequently, the State filed an appeal and sought condonation of delay. While the High Court allowed it, this Court held that the condonation of delay was improper. The Court held:

*“6. At the outset, it is urged by learned counsel for the appellants that the High Court erred in condoning the delay in filing the appeal, and the appeal should have been dismissed as barred by limitation. We have examined the facts carefully. **It appears that initially the State Government took a decision not to file an appeal and it allowed the period of limitation to lapse. Subsequently, on certain observations made by the High Court while considering a revision petition by Bhulabhai that it was a fit case where the State Government should file an appeal and on notice being issued by the High Court to the State Government in the matter, the appeal was filed. It was filed three months after limitation had expired.** A faint attempt was made to show that when the initial decision was taken not to file an appeal all the papers had not been considered by the department concerned, but we are not impressed by that allegation. **The truth appears to be that the appeal was not filed at first because the State Government saw no case on the merits for an appeal, and it was filed only because the High Court had observed — and that was long after limitation had expired — that the case was fit for appeal by the State Government. Now, it is true that a party is entitled to wait until the last day of limitation for filing an appeal. But when it allows limitation to expire and pleads sufficient cause for not filing the appeal earlier, the sufficient cause must establish that because of some event or circumstance arising before limitation expired it was not possible to file the appeal within time. No event or circumstance arising after the expiry of limitation can constitute such sufficient cause. There may be events or circumstances subsequent to the expiry of limitation which may further delay the filing of the***

Digital Supreme Court Reports

appeal. But that the limitation has been allowed to expire without the appeal being filed must be traced to a cause arising within the period of limitation. In the present case, there was no such cause, and the High Court erred in condoning the delay.

[emphasis supplied]

25. Similarly, in most of these cases, the prescribed period of limitation had already expired long before the judgments in [*Shailendra \(supra\)*](#) and [*Manoharlal \(supra\)*](#) were delivered. The appellants let the limitation period lapse, perhaps because they saw no case on merits for appeal. When the law was subsequently re-interpreted in the afore-cited two cases, the appellants approached this Court with the present appeals, petitions, and applications. Instead of showing a sufficient cause arising within the period of limitation, they are using an event after the expiry of such period to justify the delay. This does not square with our understanding of the law, and cannot be allowed.
26. This leads us to the *second* reason for disagreeing with the ground, which is that a party cannot be allowed to take advantage of its deliberate inaction during the limitation period. Allowing to the contrary would distort incentives for parties and create dystopian consequences for our judicial process. To put this in right perspective, two scenarios can be juxtaposed: *one*, where the appellants had been vigilant and had preferred an appeal within the limitation period, but would have failed to succeed as the governing law during that time was as stated by [*Pune Municipal Corporation \(supra\)*](#) and [*Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association \(supra\)*](#); and *second*, where the appellants deliberately allowed the limitation period to expire and have now approached this Court using the subsequent change of law as a ground for allowing the appeals. Now, if the appellants are allowed to file the appeals in the second scenario, it will lead to an anomalous situation where the appellants that were vigilant were not able to get the remedy but the ones that were sleeping over their rights would obtain relief. This would run counter to the purpose of the Limitation Act, which, instead of giving finality to the proceedings, would be permitting the parties to use the delay to their advantage.
27. *Thirdly*, if subsequent change of law is allowed as a valid ground for condonation of delay, it would open a Pandora's Box where all the cases that were subsequently overruled, or the cases that had

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

relied on the judgements that were subsequently overruled, would approach this Court and would seek a relief based on the new interpretation of law. There would be no finality to the proceedings and every time this Court would reach a different conclusion from its previous case, all such cases and the cases relying on it would be reopened.

28. We find adequate support to our afore-stated reason in [*Tilokchand & Motichand v. H.B. Munshi*](#),³⁴ in which a 5-Judge Bench of this Court had the occasion to consider the question of condonation of delay on the basis of subsequent change of law. While giving the majority opinion, Hidayatullah, C.J. held:

“[...] Everybody is presumed to know the law. It was his duty to have brought the matter before this Court for consideration. In any event, having set the machinery of law in motion he cannot abandon it to resume it after a number of years, because another person more adventurous than he in his turn got the statute declared unconstitutional, and got a favourable decision. If I were to hold otherwise, then the decision of the High Court in any case once adjudicated upon and acquiesced in, may be questioned in a fresh litigation revived only with the argument that the correct position was not known to the petitioner at the time when he abandoned his own litigation. [...]”

[emphasis supplied]

29. Finally, the *fourth* reason why subsequent overruling of a judgement cannot be a sufficient cause is because when a case is overruled, it is only its binding nature as a precedent that is taken away and the *lis* between the parties is still deemed to have been settled by the overruled case.³⁵ It is a settled principle of law that even an erroneous decision operates as *res judicata* between the parties.³⁶ Hence, when [*Manoharlal*](#) (*supra*) overruled [*Pune Municipal Corporation*](#) (*supra*) and [*Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association*](#) (*supra*),

34 [1969] 2 SCR 824 : (1969) 1 SCC 110, para 12.

35 [*Neelima Srivastava v. State of Uttar Pradesh*](#), 2021 SCC Online SC 610, para 30.

36 [*R. Unnikrishnan v. V.K. Mahanudevan*](#) (2014) 4 SCC 434, para 19-23.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

as well as all other cases relying on them, it only overruled their precedential value, and did not reopen the *lis* between the parties. The mere fact that the impugned orders in the present case were overruled by [Manoharlal \(supra\)](#) would not, therefore, be a sufficient ground to argue that the cases should be reopened.

30. In this respect, it would be pertinent to highlight an exception—cases that are still pending before this Court. If the *lis* is still pending and has not reached finality, those cases would be decided on the basis of [Manoharlal \(supra\)](#). This is because a decision on the interpretation of law is applied retrospectively unless the court specifically rules as to its prospective applicability.
31. There can, however, be no doubt that a *lis* will have to be decided as per the new interpretation if during its pendency, the law has been construed in a different manner by a subsequent judgement. We say so for the reason that such new construction shall be deemed to be the correct understanding of the statute from its very inception. We find support in this regard from [Shyam Madan Mohan Ruia v. Messer Holdings Ltd.](#),³⁷ in which the High Court had dismissed the suit based on the decision of this Court in [Foreshore Coop. Housing Society Ltd. v. Praveen D. Desai](#).³⁸ During the pendency of appeal, [Foreshore Coop. Housing Society Ltd. \(supra\)](#) was overruled in the case of [Nusli Neville Wadia v. Ivory Properties](#).³⁹ This Court while deciding the issue in [Shyam Mohan Ruia \(supra\)](#), held that since the precedent forming the very basis of the High Court's decision stood overruled, the dispute before it must be decided as per the later decision.
32. To sum up, we hold that subsequent change of law will not be attracted unless a case is pending before the competent court awaiting its final adjudication. To say it differently, if a case has already been decided, it cannot be re-opened and re-decided solely on the basis of a new interpretation given to that law.

D.3. Leeway to be granted to government entities

33. The appellants have vehemently contended that the government entities ought to be allowed leeway for condonation of delay. For

³⁷ [\[2019\] 15 SCR 396](#) : (2020) 5 SCC 252, para 18.

³⁸ [\[2015\] 5 SCR 1075](#) : (2015) 6 SCC 412

³⁹ [\[2019\] 15 SCR 795](#) : (2020) 6 SCC 557

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

this, the appellants placed reliance on **Collector (LA) (supra)** and **G. Ramegowda (supra)** which held that courts ought to be generous while considering delay on the part of government entities given factors unique to them like the impersonal nature of their functioning, inherited bureaucratic methodology, and procedural red-tapeism.

34. However, with time, the position of law held in these cases has been diluted. In **Commissioner of Wealth Tax v. Amateur Riders Club**,⁴⁰ this Court noted that while latitude can be granted to the government, it has to show its *bona fide* and diligence in filing the appeals. In case of bureaucratic indifference, delay cannot be condoned.
35. Subsequently, in the case of **Postmaster General (supra)**, this Court noted that the delay cannot be condoned mechanically only because the appellant is a government entity. The Court explicitly negated the earlier rationale of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology given modern improvements in technology. Lastly, the Court held that government entities must show *bona fide* and demonstrate diligence in pursuing the matter.
36. This Court has again in **State of Madhya Pradesh v. Bherulal**,⁴¹ reiterated the reasoning of the **Postmaster General (supra)** and held that the **Collector (LA) (supra)** could not be relied upon any longer as it was laid down in a different bureaucratic and technological period. The proposition that government entities ought to be afforded greater latitude on issues of delay on account of administrative exigencies, is no longer a precedent to be followed routinely.
37. Although the appellants have cited two more decisions of this Court in support of their prayer for condonation of delay, we find both of them distinguishable on facts. In **Koting Lamkang (supra)** a three-judge bench of this Court, in the peculiar circumstances where certain individual officers had acted with *mala fide*, chose not to extend the burden of individual recklessness to the State's institutional interest; as may be seen from the following extract:

40 (1994) Supp. (2) SCC 603, para 3.

41 [\[2020\] 8 SCR 912](#) : (2020) 10 SCC 654, para 3.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

*“8. Regard should be had in similar such circumstances to the impersonal nature of the Government’s functioning **where individual officers may fail to act responsibly. This in turn, would result in injustice to the institutional interest of the State. If the appeal filed by the State are lost for individual default, those who are at fault, will not usually be individually affected.**”*

[emphasis supplied]

38. Similarly, in [*Sheo Raj Singh*](#) (*supra*), the marked distinction was the scope of interference by this Court while exercising judicial review of an order of condoning delay passed by a High Court. This Court distinguished between the two situations, namely: (i) its constraints while sitting in appeal over a discretionary order; and (ii) itself considering an application for condonation of delay. Such a distinction is discernable from the following passage in [*Sheo Raj Singh*](#) (*supra*):

*“30. Be that as it may, it is important to bear in mind that **we are not hearing an application for condonation of delay but sitting in appeal over a discretionary order of the High Court granting the prayer for condonation of delay. In the case of the former, whether to condone or not would be the only question whereas in the latter, whether there has been proper exercise of discretion in favour of grant of the prayer for condonation would be the question...**”*

[emphasis supplied]

39. It seems to us that acceding to the appellants’ request on the aforesaid account would also have undesirable consequences. If delay were to be condoned merely on the basis of a broad general assertion of bureaucratic indifference, without requiring demonstration of *bona fide* or an act of *mala fide* on the part of specific individuals, it would create an artificial distinction between the private parties and the government entities vis-à-vis the law of limitation. This would not be in conformity with the spirit of equality before law as guaranteed under our Constitution. Allowing such latitude would further distort incentives for the government and encourage more laxity by the bureaucracy in its general functioning, thereby undermining quality governance.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.**D.4. COVID-19 Pandemic**

40. The fourth ground taken by the appellants is that the delay ought to be condoned on account of the COVID-19 pandemic. At this juncture, it would be apposite to discuss the series of orders passed by this Court regarding the operation of limitation vis-à-vis the COVID-19 pandemic.
41. Vide order dt. 23.03.2020 ***In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation***,⁴² this Court passed an omnibus order extending the period of limitation for proceedings before all courts/tribunals in the country from 15.03.2020 till further orders. Subsequently, vide an order dt. 08.03.2021, this Court noted the lifting of the nation-wide pandemic lockdown and a return to normalcy. Accordingly, the Court brought an end to the extension and held that:

*“I. In computing the period of limitation for any suit, appeal, application or proceeding, the **period from 15.03.2020 till 14.03.2021 shall stand excluded. Consequently, the balance period of limitation remaining as on 15.03.2020, if any, shall become available with effect from 15.03.2021.***

*II. In **cases where the limitation would have expired during the period between 15.03.2020 till 14.03.2021, notwithstanding the actual balance period of limitation remaining, all persons shall have a limitation period of 90 days from 15.03.2021.** In the event the actual balance period of limitation remaining, with effect from 15.03.2021, is greater than 90 days, that longer period shall apply.*

*III. The period from 15.03.2020 till 14.03.2021 shall also stand excluded in computing the periods prescribed under Sections 23 (4) and 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and provisos (b) and (c) of Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and **any other laws, which prescribe period(s) of limitation for instituting proceedings, outer limits (within which the***

42 (2020) 19 SCC 10, para 2.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

court or tribunal can condone delay and termination of proceeding [...]”.

[emphasis supplied]

42. However, when COVID-19 cases across the country rose again, a miscellaneous application was filed and vide an order dt. 27.04.2021,⁴³ this Court restored the order dated 23.03.2020 and held that the period of limitation is to be extended till further orders. This came to an end on 23.09.2021 when directions to exclude the period between 15.03.2020 and 02.10.2021 from limitation were issued.⁴⁴
43. On account of the third wave of Pandemic, the aforementioned order dated 23.09.2021 was finally modified on 10.01.2022, with a total period of approximately 716 days between 15.03.2020-28.02.2022 being excluded from the operation of limitation.⁴⁵
44. The respondents submit that the orders of this Court passed by this Court from time to time as referred to above, would not come to the aid of the appellants since these orders saved only those actions and proceedings which were within the period of limitation as on 15.03.2020. They contended that the aforementioned orders ought not to be construed in a manner to resuscitate actions and proceedings that were time-barred before the onset of COVID-19 pandemic. If the limitation period had already expired before the pandemic, such cases could not take shelter behind the general relief granted by this Court in ***In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation (supra)***. The respondents buttressed their arguments by relying upon [**Sagufa Ahmed v. Upper Assam Plywood Products \(P\) Ltd.**](#)⁴⁶
45. [**Sagufa Ahmed \(supra\)**](#) construed that the orders passed ***In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation (supra)*** were intended to benefit vigilant litigants who were prevented due to the pandemic and the lockdown, from initiating proceedings within the period of limitation prescribed by general or special law. We respectfully agree with the view taken in [**Sagufa Ahmed \(supra\)**](#). Consequently, the benefit of ***In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation (supra)***

43 2021 SCC Online SC 373, para 6-7.

44 2021 SCC Online SC 947, para 8.

45 (2022) 3 SCC 117, para 5.

46 [\[2020\] 9 SCR 472](#) : (2021) 2 SCC 317, para 17.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

can be availed by the appellants only in a case where the period of limitation expired between 15.03.2020 and 28.02.2022.

D.5. Supreme Court frowning upon the filing of fresh SLPs

46. In addition to the above grounds, the appellants claim that they were unable to file the appeals before *Shailendra (supra)* came as this Court was discouraging them from filing fresh SLPs by dismissing such petitions *in limine* and imposing heavy costs.
47. We are not inclined to accept the above stated plea as a good ground to condone the delay. Even if the appellants' contention is believed to be true that some of the SLPs were dismissed on the strength of the then governing law as laid down in *Pune Municipal Corporation (supra)*, this could not be an impediment for filing SLPs on time. Had it been so, this Court would not have had the opportunity to reconsider *Pune Municipal Corporation (supra)* and *Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association (supra)*. That apart, some of the cases which are part of this batch were filed before *Shailendra (supra)*, which belies the appellants' stance. Instead, it is likely that the appellants took a careful, considered and conscious call of not agitating their claims as they perceived their chances of success to be bleak.

D.6. Public interest and justice

48. As a final contention, the appellants have sought this Court's indulgence asserting 'public interest' and the 'larger cause of justice'. Against this, respondents have argued that the delay cannot be condoned merely based on broad assertions of equity.
49. We agree in principle with the respondents to the extent that deliberate, reckless or negligent delays ought not to be condoned, even if counterweighed by public interest since it may unfairly affect third-party rights that may have vested during the period of lapse. This simplistic framing would, however, not be apt for the present fact situation which is far more complex.
50. Although at first glance it might appear that this Court is merely tasked with balancing the interests of the public exchequer against that of individual respondents, however, a deeper examination would reveal that there are many other interests at stake and it might not be possible to undo the acquisitions without causing significant cascading harms and losses to public infrastructure.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

51. Most of the acquisitions here have reached finalization as possession had been taken over or compensation stood paid. Additionally, development projects have also begun on many of such lands. In numerous cases, the land has been deployed for essential public projects such as hospitals, schools, expansion of the metro, etc. Hence, the effect of non-condonation of delay would go beyond mere financial loss to the exchequer, and instead extend to the public at large.
52. Moreover, there would also be a significant unscrambling the egg problem, where compensation paid would have to be clawed back or possession taken would have to be reversed. Problematically, in many cases, the development projects might also have to be undone. In some instances—such as reversing the possession of one small plot lying on an under-construction metro corridor—it would be practically impossible.
53. As discussed in paragraphs 11 to 13 of this judgement, in addition to the *bona fides* of the condonation-seekers and the broader impact of condoning the delay, it is equally important to look at the effect of condonation on the opposite side, particularly in cases where rights have vested. As the facts speak for themselves, invaluable rights have been vested to the public at large, given the public infrastructure that has come up on a large number of these acquired lands—especially in those cases where the possession had been taken.
54. Furthermore, even if we were to settle the *lis* by not condoning delay, it is unlikely that the respondent-landowners would be able to keep their lands as the appellants are empowered under law to initiate acquisition proceedings afresh. Although there might be a difference in the quantum of compensation owed to the respondent-landowners, it would come at the expense of delaying the construction of critical public infrastructure in our national capital. When balancing public with private interest, the quantum and adequacy of compensation do not compel us much. Hence, we believe that the comparative impact on the respondent-landowners would be minimal.
55. We also cannot be oblivious to the fact that the multiplicity of contradictory judicial opinions on Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act within a relatively short span of time have made the present set of circumstances *sui generis*. The constant flux in the legal position of law undoubtedly created significant challenges for the appellants while

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

approaching this Court, none of which we can ignore outrightly. In addition, we would also reiterate at this juncture that we have found no *mala fide* on part of the appellants or their officers.

56. The impact of not condoning the delay would thus be three-fold, which taken altogether make a compelling case for condonation of delay: *one*, there will be significant harm to the public at large by way of delayed infrastructure, in addition to financial loss to the public exchequer; *second*, the comparative benefit to landowners would not be substantial given that no indefeasible rights have been vested with them as the *lis* has not yet acquired quietus in most cases; and *third*, the matter would still not attain finality as the State is likely to invoke its power of eminent domain and reinitiate acquisition proceedings given the criticality of the infrastructure being built. We do not feel that these consequences further the ends of limitation law. As discussed earlier in paragraph 13, the law of limitation is intended to curb the evil of deliberate or negligent laxity in legal proceedings, which is not the case here. Hence, the larger interest of justice mandates us to condone the delay in the present batch of cases. The consequential relief, after condonation of delay, is however dealt with in Part E (*infra*) below.
57. This approach is also seconded by the case of [State of Jharkhand v. Lalu Prasad Yadav](#),⁴⁷ in which this Court noted that while the Central Bureau of Investigation failed to follow its own manual and filed SLPs with delay, such delay should be condoned in light of the facts of the case and to advance the cause of justice.
58. We note that the respondents have cited [Pundlik Jalam Patil](#) (*supra*) to argue that public interest cannot be a sole ground to seek condonation of delay. A closer examination of the aforementioned case, however, would show that the Court in that case denied condonation of delay as the government had been found to be negligent and given that it had been established that the landowners depended on the acquired lands for their livelihood. As discussed above, that is not the case here, especially in the case of landowners in NCT of Delhi, which is almost entirely urban and whose residents generally do not depend on the agricultural income as the source of their livelihood.

47 [\[2017\] 3 SCR 630](#) : (2017) 8 SCC 1, para 67-69.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

D.7. Delay already condoned in some cases

59. While seeking condonation of delay in filing of the present appeals, the appellants have also urged that this Court had already condoned the delay in some of the SLPs and granted leave in such petitions. Against these, the respondents have argued that such condonation was done by *ex-parte* orders.
60. The proviso to Rule 9(1) of Order XXI of the Supreme Court Rules, 2013 reads:

*“Provided that where a petition for special leave has been filed beyond the period of limitation prescribed therefor and is accompanied by an application for condonation of delay, **the Court shall not condone the delay without notice to the respondent**”*

[emphasis supplied]

61. As per the aforementioned rule, condonation of delay ought not to be done by the Court *ex-parte*. However, an identical version of this rule in the previous Supreme Court Rules of 1966 was interpreted in [*High Court of Judicature of Patna v. Madan Mohan Prasad*](#),⁴⁸ in which, this Court held that while it is prudent to give notice before condonation of delay, not giving of notice is not fatal to the case. The claimant will be allowed to point out at the stage of hearing that this Court was not justified in condoning the delay and that the leave, if granted, should be revoked or notice issued should be dismissed.
62. The condonation of delay in some of these cases without issuing any notice, is now an inconsequential issue, for we have already extensively dealt with the grounds for condonation of delay. The respondent-landowners too have been heard at length over the course of the proceedings, which we believe satisfies the standard laid down in [*Madan Mohan Prasad \(supra\)*](#).
63. Nevertheless, we are also conscious of the fact that no notice was issued in some of the cases, and the parties thereto have not been accorded an opportunity of hearing. All such cases, which we include in the annexed ‘List-B’, are therefore ordered to be de-tagged and be listed separately on 22.07.2024.

48 [\[2011\] 13 SCR 972](#) : (2011) 9 SCC 65, para 38.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.**E. Conclusion and Directions**

64. The analysis in the foregoing paragraphs prompts us to hold that while some of the arguments put forth by the government authorities for condonation of delay, like subsequent change of law, special leeway for government entities, or the Court allegedly frowning upon filing of fresh SLPs; cannot be accepted, however, the appellants have made out sufficient cause for condonation of delay on the ground of public interest. In addition, the cases where allegations of suppression of material facts have been made also cannot be rejected at the threshold. Similarly, if a case falls within the parameters laid down in ***In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation (supra)***, namely, that the delay occurred on account of the COVID-19 pandemic, such delay can also be condoned. Consequently, the delay is condoned in all these matters, except those mentioned in 'List-B', 'List-C.2', 'List-D.2' and 'List-E.1' (*infra*).
65. Having condoned the delay and upon grant of leave and after perusing the material on record, we find that the cases which form part of the appended 'List-E.2' are squarely covered in favor of the appellants in terms of ***Manoharlal (supra)***. While it may not be feasible to give detailed analysis of each of these cases, suffice it would be to show the same illustratively. For instance, in SLP (C) Diary No. 19172/2019, titled "DDA v. Vijay Mohan", while the possession was admittedly not taken, compensation was paid on 09.08.2005. Accordingly, the test laid down in ***Manoharlal (supra)*** has been met and the acquisition proceedings cannot be deemed to have lapsed under the 2013 Act.
66. All such civil appeals are accordingly allowed, the impugned judgment of the High Court in each case is set aside, and the acquisition of the respondents' lands under 1894 Act is consequently upheld. This will, however, not preclude the respondents from recovery of the compensation amount, if not already paid or to the extent it is not paid, along with interest and other statutory benefits under 1894 Act. Similarly, they shall be at liberty to seek reference under Section 18 of the 1894 Act in accordance with law. The Government of NCT of Delhi and its authorities are directed to take physical possession of the lands falling under this category (i.e., 'List-E.2'), if not already taken and continue uninterruptedly to complete the public infrastructure projects.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

67. Similarly, we find on perusal of the record that the cases which we have included in the appended 'List-C.1' are covered by the ratio of **KL Rathi (supra)** and are disposed of accordingly. As regards to the cases which form part of 'List-C.2', it appears that the Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications are based on grounds other than change of law. Such Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications are required to be examined on a case-to-case basis. Accordingly, these cases are also de-tagged and ordered to be listed separately on 22.07.2024.
68. Likewise, we have identified the cases enlisted as D.1, which fall within the four corners of our analysis in **GNCTD v. BSK Realtors**.⁴⁹ All these cases are, therefore, disposed of by invoking our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution in terms of the directions issued in **BSK Realtors (supra)**. On the same analogy, there are cases included in 'List-D.2', where the impugned judgements have been already set aside in the previous rounds of litigation. All these matters have thus been rendered infructuous. Ordered accordingly.
69. It has also been brought to our notice that in some of the cases (see 'List-E.1') notice was issued only on delay and not on merits. Since delay has now been condoned, we direct that let notice be issued in these petitions on merits, returnable on 22.07.2024.
70. At this stage, we may hasten to add that the cases mentioned in the appended 'List-A' contain allegations of fraud against the landowners. As discussed in paragraph 21, given that a detailed fact-finding inquiry is necessary to ascertain the rightful title-holder and the claimant of receiving the compensation, we hereby set aside the orders of the High Court that are under challenge in these civil appeals or in the civil appeals out of which the subject Review Petitions or Miscellaneous Applications have arisen. We revive the relevant writ petitions, which shall stand restored on the file of the High Court. After deciding the question of suppression of facts, the High Court shall proceed to dispose of the cases on merits, in terms of our dictum in these batch of cases.
71. In this regard, the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the High Court of Delhi is requested to constitute a dedicated bench to decide these writ

49 SLP(C) Diary No. 17623/2021.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

petitions in the manner indicated hereafter. The nominated bench will accord an opportunity to the landowners/subsequent purchasers and the appellants herein to submit additional documents on affidavits whereupon such bench shall embark on an exercise to decide who between the landowner(s) and the subsequent purchaser(s) is the rightful claimant to receive compensation. The nominated bench will have the authority to obtain independent fact-finding enquiry reports, if deemed necessary. The inquiry could include determination as to whether after the notification under Section 4(1) of the 1894 Act, any transfer could have been effected and if so, whether such transfer is permitted by law. Once compensation is determined, the relevant authority in the land acquisition department shall deposit the same with the Reference Court. The Reference Court shall then invest the deposited amount in a short-term interest-bearing fixed deposit account with a nationalized bank, ensuring its periodical renewal until the relevant writ petition is disposed of by the nominated bench. Release of the invested amount together with the accrued interest to the rightful claimant will be contingent upon the decision of the High Court.

72. Lastly, we find that there are some cases which are included in 'List-E.3' where the appellants not only failed to take possession of the acquired land but also did not pay any compensation. Consequently, the appellants cannot seek protection under [Manoharlal](#) (*supra*). At the same time, we are of the considered view that it would not subserve any public interest at large, given the unique situation at hand, if the government were to be required to fulfill all the conditions for a fresh acquisition under the 2013 Act. As analyzed before under the Head: **Public interest and justice** of this judgment, substantial harm would ensue towards the public at large if the acquisition proceedings are not concluded promptly.
73. To prevent such an outcome and after considering the unique facts and circumstances of this batch of cases, we deem it fit to exercise our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution in the interests of doing complete justice. We accordingly issue the following directions for all the cases mentioned in 'List-E.3':
- (a) The time limit for initiation of fresh acquisition proceedings in terms of the provisions contained in section 24(2) of the 2013 Act is extended by a year starting from 01st August, 2024

Digital Supreme Court Reports

whereupon compensation to the affected landowners may be paid in accordance with law, failing which consequences, also as per law, shall follow;

- (b) The parties shall maintain *status quo* regarding possession, change of land use, and creation of third-party rights till fresh acquisition proceedings, as directed above, are completed;
- (c) Since the respondent land-owners are not primarily dependent upon the subject lands as their source of sustenance and most of these lands were/are under use for other than agricultural purposes, we deem it appropriate to invoke our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution and dispense with the compliance of Chapters II and III of the 2013 Act, whereunder it is essential to prepare a Social Impact Assessment Study Report and/or to develop alternative multi-crop irrigated agricultural land. We do so to ensure that the timeline of one year extended at (a) above to complete the acquisition process can be adhered to by the appellants and the GNCTD, which would also likely be beneficial for the expropriated land owners;
- (d) Similarly, compliance with Sections 13, 14, and 16 to 20 of 2013 Act can be dispensed with as the subject-lands are predominantly urban/semi-urban in nature and had earlier been acquired for public purposes of paramount importance. In order to simplify the compliance of direction at (a) above, it is further directed that every Notification issued under Section 4(1) of the 1894 Act in this batch of cases shall be treated as a Preliminary Notification within the meaning of Section 11 of the 2013 Act, and shall be deemed to have been published as on 01.01.2014;
- (e) The Collector shall provide hearing of objections as per Section 15 of the 2013 Act without insisting for any Social Impact Assessment Report and shall, thereafter, proceed to take necessary steps as per the procedure contemplated under Section 21 onwards of Chapter-IV of the 2013 Act, save and except where compliance of any provision has been expressly or impliedly dispensed with;
- (f) The land-owners may submit their objections within a period of four weeks from the date of pronouncement of this Order.

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

Such objections shall not question the legality of the acquisition process and shall be limited only to clauses (a) and (b) of Section 15(1) of the 2013 Act;

- (g) The Collector shall publish a public notice on his website and also in one English and one vernacular newspaper, within two weeks of expiry of the period granted under direction (f) above, so as to accord personal hearing to all the persons interested in the land under acquisition in terms of Section 21(1) of the 2013 Act. Such hearing shall also be restricted only to the nature of objections as per direction (f) above and/or the determination of compensation for the acquired land;
- (h) The Collector shall, thereafter, pass an award as early as possible but not exceeding six months, regardless of the maximum period of twelve months contemplated under Section 25 of the 2013 Act. The market value of the land shall be assessed as on 01.01.2014 and the compensation shall be awarded along with all other monetary benefits in accordance with the provisions of the 2013 Act except the claim like rehabilitation etc.;
- (i) The Collector shall consider all the parameters prescribed under Section 28 of the 2013 Act for determining the compensation for the acquired land. Similarly, the Collector shall determine the market value of the building or assets attached with the land in accordance with Section 29 of the 2013 Act, and shall further award solatium in accordance with Section 30 of the 2013 Act;
- (j) In the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, since it is difficult to reverse the clock back, the compliance of Chapter (V) pertaining to “Rehabilitation and Resettlement Award” is hereby dispensed with; and
- (k) The expropriated land-owners shall be entitled to seek reference for enhancement of compensation in accordance with Chapter-VIII of the 2013 Act.

74. Finally, apart from the aforementioned segregation of cases, the present batch of matters also includes SLP(C) No. 14308/2020 (Ashok Pratap Singh v. GNCTD) that has been filed by the landowner seeking altogether different relief. Accordingly, this case is ordered to be de-tagged and listed separately on 22.07.2024.

Digital Supreme Court Reports

75. Before parting, we deem it appropriate to provide a cautionary note that the limited fact-finding conducted by this Court may not be entirely accurate due to the complex nature of cases involving subsequent sale transactions, earlier rounds of litigation, land titles, and status of compensation and/or possession. We accordingly grant liberty to the parties to approach the High Court if any factual disputes arise in future or if further clarification is required, and the High Court shall decide such cases based on the principles outlined above, taking into account the facts and, if necessary, the merits of the case.
76. It is also needless to clarify that the High Court shall proceed to decide the cases remitted to it as expeditiously as possible, but subject to its convenience, in accordance with law.
77. All the matters stand disposed of in aforementioned terms.

Appendix

List	Sub-lists (if any)	Description	Result
List A (Suppression of facts)	-	Cases where the respondent-landowners are alleged to have suppressed facts regarding them being subsequent purchasers and/or the land having vested in Gaon Sabha.	Remanded back to the High Court
List B (Notice neither on delay nor on merits)	-	Notice not issued either on delay or on merits, and as such no opportunity was given to the landowners to contend the issue of delay.	De-tagged and listed separately on 22 July 2024.
List C (Review Petitions/MAs)	List C.1	Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications primarily pleading change of law.	To be dismissed using Article 142 and acquisition to be re-initiated under 2013 Act (as per <i>KL Rathi (supra)</i>).
	List C.2	Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications filed before <i>Shailendra (supra)</i> and/or not primarily pleading change of law.	De-tagged and listed separately on 22 July 2024 (as per <i>KL Rathi (supra)</i>)

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

List D (Leave granted in previous SLP)	List D.1	Previous SLP dismissed after granting leave.	To be dismissed using Article 142 and acquisition to be re-initiated under 2013 Act (as per BSK Realtors (supra)).
	List D.2	Previous SLP allowed after granting leave.	To be dismissed for having become infructuous (as per BSK Realtors (supra))
List E (Leave not granted in previous SLP)	List E.1	No previous SLP or leave not granted in previous SLP, notice issued on delay, but no notice issued on merits in the present SLP.	De-tagged and listed separately on 22 July 2024, for determining whether Manoharlal (supra) is satisfied or not.
	List E.2	No previous SLP or leave not granted in previous SLP, notice on merits issued in the present SLP, and Manoharlal (supra) test applicable.	The acquisition under 1894 Act upheld.
	List E.3	No previous SLP or leave not granted in previous SLP, notice issued on merits in the present SLP, Manoharlal (supra) test not applicable.	To be dismissed using Article 142 and acquisition to be re-initiated under 2013 Act.

List A: Suppression of facts

S. No.	Case Title
1.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. TEJPAL [SLP(C) 026697/2019]
2.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SARLA GUPTA (DEAD) THROUGH LRS. [D. No. 12659/2022]
3.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BISHAN SINGH [D. No. 411/2023]
4.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VIKRANT [D. No. 2517/2021]
5.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NEERAJ JAIN [R.P]-[D. No. 18945/2018]
6.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAN SINGH [SLP No. 15081/2019]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

7.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAI SINGH [D.No. 3365/2023]
8.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S NATURE TECH BUILDERS LTD. [D. No. 7862/2021]
9.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR EAST vs. MAHESH CHAND [D. No. 37815/2022]
10.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAM PRASAD [SLP(C) 17053/2022]
11.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. UMA MEHRA [D. No. 2441/2022]
12.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DHANI RAM (DEAD) [D. No. 20223/2021]
13.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VEENU KOCHER [MA No. 1268/2019]
14.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S IMPRESS ESTATES PVT. LTD. [D. No. 77/2023]
15.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ROOPRAM [D. No. 10266/2019]
16.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. VIKRAM SETH [D. No. 11258/2023]
17.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. VIMAL JAIN [D. No. 8523/2018]
18.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAYBIR [SLP(C) No. 2877/ 2018]
19.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BRAHM SINGH [D. No. 21739/2019]
20.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KUSHAL KUMAR GOGA [D. No. 12924/2022]
21.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DHANI RAM [D. No. 21888/2020]
22.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. M/S MALSH ENTERPRISES PVT. LTD. [D. No. 10476/2022]
23.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RANBIR SINGH DAGAR [D. No. 762/2022]
24.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AJAB SINGH [SLP(C) No. 22853/2019]
25.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SURESH KUMAR [D. No. 1894/2021]
26.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARJUN CHOPRA [SLP(C) No. 4400/2019]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

27.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. TARA KAUR SARANG [D. No. 1359/2022]
28.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SUNITA DASS [D. No. 22560/2020]
29.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PREM SINGH [D. No. 2588/2022]
30.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KAMLESH [SLP(C) No. 5509/2020]
31.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. FAUZIA SIDDIQUI [D. No. 1564/2022]
32.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MUNISH KUMAR [SLP (C) No.13046/2022]
33.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KIRAN KUMAR ANAND [SLP(C) No. 4398/2019]
34.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANOOP NARANG [SLP(C) No.8758 /2016]
35.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KANIKA GANDOTRA [SLP(C) No. 9059/2019]
36.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AMAN [SLP(C) No. 30451/2018]
37.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGVATI DEVI [SLP(C) No. 030454/2018]
38.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHOK GARG [SLP(C) No. 22131/2019]
39.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PIMA LAL [SLP(C) No. 030445/2018]
40.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SMT. AMAN [SLP(C) No. 20203/2018]
41.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SH. PREM CHAND [SLP(C) No.20202/2018]
42.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJ SINGH [24244/2020]
43.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ANILJIT SINGH [D. No. 9458/2021]
44.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. LAKHMEERI [D. No. 29094/2021]
45.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAM PHAL [SLP No. 30446/2018]
46.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MANZOOR-UL-HAQ [DIARY NO 13505/2022 R.P.(C) No]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

47.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BALRAJ [SLP(C) No. 029825/2018]
48.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. UDAY SINGH [MA No. 46/2023]
49.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRAVEEN KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 22849/2019]
50.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAMA SHANKAR KHEMAKA [SLP(C) No. 394/2019]
51.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAMESH SINGH [SLP(C) No. 22860/2019]
52.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ATTAR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 22862/2019]
53.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SURESH KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 22863/2019]
54.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KUNDAN RAM @ KUNDAN SINGH (DEAD) [SLP(C) No. 22865/2019]
55.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HARSH AHUJA [SLP(C) No. 014565/ 2019]
56.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SHIVSHANKAR SHIVHARE [SLP(C) No. 22855/2019]
57.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. J.N. CHAMBER [SLP(C) No. 26088/2018]
58.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. CHARAN DAS [D. No. 28985/2020]
59.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGH ITS SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. M/S NATURE TECH BUILDERS LTD [D. No. 29643/2021]
60.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GYAN SINGH [C.A. No. 005539 / 2017]
61.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BHUSHAN NANGIA [D. No. SLP(C) No. 003825/2017]
62.	NCT OF DELHI vs. VINAY KUMAR GUPTA [D. No. 27992/2022]
63.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. GAJRAJ [D. NO. 28683/2021]
64.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SARITA JAIN [D. No. 17877/2021]
65.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ISHRAT ALI [SLP(C) No. 021273/2018]
66.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MUKESH [D.No.27935/2022]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

67.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI THRU SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. LAJJAWATI [SLP(C) No. 14573/2019]
68.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SURESH [SLP(C) 740/2018]
69.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KHAYALWATI [SLP(C) 000738/2018]
70.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. M/S. TAROUNI CONSTRUCTION AND FINANCE P LTD. [D.No.14064/2023]
71.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JASWANT [D.No.27989/2022]
72.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SONA DEVI [SLP(C) No. 29157/2018]
73.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PYARI RAUTHAN [D. No. 14069/2023]
74.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. CHAMAN SINGH [SLP(C) No. 28438/2018]
75.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SURENDER KUMAR VATS [SLP(C) No. 24781/2019]
76.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PARAM MITRA MANAV NIRMAN SANSTHAN [D.No.15001/2023]
77.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BHAN DEVI [SLP(C) No. 008768/2016]
78.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. ALOK KUMAR [D.No.15623/2022]
79.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GAURAV SAHNI [MA No. 2327/2019]
80.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DHARMA PAL AGGARWAL [R.P.(C) No. 001113/2018]
81.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SHIV LAL [SLP(C) No. 36423/2016]
82.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JATINDER PAL SINGH [SLP(C) No. 30102/ 2018]
83.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SONAR PAPER PRODUCT PVT. LTD. [SLP(C) No. 28219/2018]
84.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANIL GIANCHANDANI [MA No. 1722/2023]
85.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AMRIT LAL ARORA [SLP (C). No. 4114/2019]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

86.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. GANESHI LAL JAIN [D. No. 29314/2022]
87.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUMAN CHHABRA [SLP(C) No. 032932/2018]
88.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JITENDER [SLP(C) No. 028440/2018]
89.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJIV SUD [SLP(C) No. 029614/2018]
90.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SINGH RAJ [SLP(C) No. 027689/2018]
91.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANKIT BANSAL [D.No. 6303/2018]
92.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAM KISHAN [SLP(C) No. 022259/2018]
93.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SARLA GUPTA (DEAD) THROUGH LRS. [SLP(C) No. 21557/2018]
94.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MOHD. ZUBAIR [SLP(C) No. 014576/2019]
95.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ABHA DUTTA [SLP(C) No. 16251/2018]
96.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. NASEEM AHMED [D. No. 7191/2018]
97.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUNIT BANSAL [D. No. 35922/2018]
98.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. N.S. VASISHT [D. No. 7292/2023]
99.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KALU RAM [D. No. 26604/2021]
100.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. HARSH AHUJA [SLP(C) No. 023369/2018]
101.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AJIT KUMAR @ AJIT KUMAR CHAUDHARY [26687/2021]
102.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. MUKTESH LEKHI [D. No. 9433/2022]
103.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PHOOLWATI [D. No. 23683/2020]
104.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AJAB SINGH [SLP(C) No. 12692/2020]
105.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VEER WATI [SLP(C) No. 4895/2020]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

106.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MANISH GUPTA [D. No. 1558/2020]
107.	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR vs. VEER WATI [D. No. 4860/2023]
108.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ASHA RAM TYAGI [D. No. 5017/2023]
109.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SIRAJUDDIN [D. No. 7061/2023]
110.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VINOD KUMAR [D. No. 30377/2021]
111.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAIPAL SINGH [SLP(C) No. 032412/ 2018]
112.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HARINDER KAUSHIK [SLP (C) 7945/2019]
113.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BALJEET SINGH [SLP(C) No. 7950/2019]
114.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUNIL KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 11170/2019]
115.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. SHRI AJAY KUMAR [SLP (C) No. 395/2019]
116.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GURNAM ARORA [MA 001647/2023]
117.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARUNA SINGH [MA 1931/2023]
118.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. GAURAV [D. No. 29070/2020]
119.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SURESH KUMAR [D. No. 41950/2019]
120.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJ KUMAR ARORA [D. No. 3079/2023]
121.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VIKRAM SINGH [SLP(C) No. 030103 - / 2018]
122.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SHIV KUMAR THROUGH GURNAM SINGH KOCHHAR [SLP (C) No. 3259/2019]
123.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUNANDA DEVI SARAF [SLP(C)No.022691/ 2018]
124.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAMPAL [SLP(C) No. 005818/2018]
125.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BHAGWATI DEVI (DEAD) [SLP(C) No. 031870 -/2018]
126.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. YOGESH KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 024080/2018]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

List B: Notice neither on delay nor on merits

S. No.	Case Title
1.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ARCHANA KHANNA [D. No. 20119/2023]
2.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SURENDRA SINGH PENTAL [D. No. 14018/2023]
3.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BISHAN SINGH [D. No. 402/2023]
4.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. CHAMAN SINGH [D. No. 515/2023]
5.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARINDER KAUSHIK [D. No. 14075/2023]
6.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VIKRAM SARIN [D. No. 15572/2022]
7.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ZILE SINGH [D. No. 32665/2023]
8.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MUNSHI RAM [D. No. 3747/2023]
9.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGBIR [D. No. 4083/2023]
10.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SUMAN CHHABRA [D. No. 37530/2023]
11.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VIJAY TRISHAL [D. No. 102/2023]
12.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ARJUN CHOPRA [D. No. 15557/2023]
13.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. RAJA RAM [D. No. 11587/2023]
14.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SURINDER KAUR [D. No. 6339/2023]
15.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PAWAN MATHUR [D. No. 6515/2023]
16.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VEERA SINGH [D. No. 40963/2022]
17.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VEENA MAHAJAN [D. No. 5463/2023]
18.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. EMMSONS INTERNATIONAL LTD. [D. No. 12740/2023]
19.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BEENA GUPTA (D) THROUGH LRS. [D. No. 10980/2023]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

20.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SIDDHARTH KAPOOR [D. No. 1460/2023]
21.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SONAR PAPER PRODUCTS PVT. LTD [D. No. 18682/2023]
22.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. CHET RAM [D. No. 11765/2022]
23.	THE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PUSHP LATA JAIN [D. No. 8581/2022]
24.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAFIQ AHMED [D. No. 18684/2023]
25.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PHOOL WATI GUPTA [D. No. 19084/2023]
26.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SAAD FIROZ [D. No. 12373/2023]
27.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. OM PRAKASH [D. No. 5141/2023]
28.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GYANWATI [D. No. 38181/2023]
29.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. J.C. GUPTA [D. No. 40294/2022]
30.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. KARTARI DEVI [D. No. 19215/2023]
31.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NASEEM AHMED [D. No. 11686/2023]
32.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. ASHU [D.No. 19217/2023]
33.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BALWAN [D. No. 4086/2023]
34.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. R.S. RETAIL STORES PVT. LTD. [D. No. 11767/2023]
35.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SANJEEV GOYAL [D. No. 19652/2022]
36.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. CHANDER BHAN [D. No. 11591/2023]
37.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. URMIL MAKKAR [D. No. 12327/2023]
38.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. DHYAN SINGH [D. No. 19983/2023]
39.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PAWAN KUMAR GARG [D. No. 12328/2023]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

40.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BHARAT KUMAR. [D. No. 20490/2023]
41.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. CHHATAR PAL SINGH [D. No. 10729/2023]
42.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRITAM SINGH @ PRITAM [D. No. 10553/2023]
43.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. GREEN FINANCE PVT. LTD. [D. No. 2121/2023]
44.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SANJAY VERMANI [D. No. 11257/2023]
45.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGBIR SINGH [D. No. 724/2023]
46.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. URMIL MAKKAR [D. No. 1001/2023]
47.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MD. ILYAS [D. No. 38009/2023]
48.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DEEPAK SETH [D. No. 12025/2023]
49.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. TARLOK SINGH [D. No. 1137/2023]
50.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGJIT SINGH [D. No. 4091/2023]
51.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GHANSHYAM DAS [D. No. 21126/2023]
52.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRAVEEN KUMAR JAIN [D. No. 1464/2023]
53.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DEVRAJ SINGH [D. No. 21134/2020]
54.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MAHENDRA KUMAR [D. No. 21224/2023]
55.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. LALA RAM [D. No. 6123/2023]
56.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MEER SINGH [D.No.12331/2023]
57.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DEVINDER SINGH [D. No. 13159/2023]
58.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S AASAKTI ESTATES PVT. LTD. [D. No. 1465/2023]
59.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ZILE SINGH [D. No. 12955/2023]
60.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRASHID ESTATE PVT. LTD. [D. No. 1466/2023]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

61.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. BALJEET SINGH [D. No. 21535/2023]
62.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. RAJESH KUMAR [D. No. 21669/2023]
63.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHA RAM TYAGI [D. No. 21716/2023]
64.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SHIV LAL [D. No. 21946/2023]
65.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SATBIR SINGH AND SATYVIR [D. No. 522/2023]
66.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PARAM MITRA MANAV NIRMAN SANSTHAN [D.No. 5564/2023]
67.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SHAKUNTALA DEVI [D.No. 11597/2023]
68.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ARUN ARORA [D. No. 21997/2023]
69.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GIRISH CHHABRA [D. No. 13254/2023]
70.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SIRAJUDDIN [D. No. 22457/2023]
71.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SANTOSH DEVI [D. No. 22486/2023]
72.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. GOODVIEW APARTMENTS PVT. LTD [D. No. 22524/2023]
73.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANIL JAIN [D. No. 2556/2023]
74.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAGBIR SINGH [D. No. 25278/2022]
75.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KESHAV SURI [D. No. 13323/2023]
76.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GIRISH KUMAR [MA No. 629/2020]
77.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAM PRAKASH KATHURIA [MA No. 626/2020]
78.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SAROJ DEVI [MA No. 381/2023]
79.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Vs. GULBIR VERMA [D No. 10561 /2023]
80.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MALHE [D. No. 10704/2023]
81.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Vs. KESHAV SURI [D. No. 13153/2023]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

82.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Vs RAJAN SHARMA [D. No. 39310/2022]
83.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Vs VIKAS GUPTA [MA No 2622/2019]
84.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJA RAM [D. No. 22888/2022]
85.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Vs. MAAN SINGH [D. No. 23142/2023]
86.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BEENA GUPTA [D. No. 23688/2022]
87.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SHAKUNTALA DEVI [D. No. 23770/2022]
88.	THE LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR (THE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) vs. SATVIR [D.No. 40192/2023]
89.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VEERA SINGH [D.No. 28063/2022]
90.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AJIT SINGH [D.No.24250/2020]
91.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. LALIT KAPUR [D.No. 31982/2023]
92.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. GURNAM SINGH [D.No.13357/2023]
93.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAVED KHAN [D.No.12978/2023]
94.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MADAN MOHAN SARAFF [D.No.13368/2023]
95.	DELHI ADMINISTRATION vs. GURNAM ARORA [D.No.24367/2020]
96.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MAHINDER SAHAI [D.No.12338/2023]
97.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NAFIS AHMAD SIDDIQUI [D.No.13481/2023]
98.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JANNAT BEGUM [D. No. 33172/2023]
99.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. SUKHVEER SINGH DAGAR [D.No. 13525/2022]
100.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GYANWATI [D.No.13541/2023]
101.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR (SOUTH) THROUGH GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SUBHASH [D. No. 38406/2023]
102.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PURNIMA JAIN [D. No. 38633/2023]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

103.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAMAN DEEP [D. No. 38635/2023]
104.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. BGNS INFRATECH PVT. LTD. [D.No.13544/2023]
105.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GURSHARAN SINGH CHHABRA [D.No.38953/ 2022 - MA]
106.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AJIT SINGH MANN [D. No. 15266/2023]
107.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PRATAP SINGH [D. No. 33206/2023]
108.	DELHI METRO RAIL CORPORATION LTD. vs. KAMAL KANT BANSAL [D.No. 39526/2017]
109.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. TARA KAUR SARANG [D. No. 39775/2023]
110.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SHIV LAL [D.No.39883/2022]
111.	DDA vs. RAVI KUMAR GUPTA [D.No.40305/2022]
112.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. MST. KANIJAN [D.No.13552/2023]
113.	LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER vs. HARISH CHAND [D. No. 15543/2023]
114.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. JITENDER KUMAR AGGARWAL [D. No. 15286/2023]
115.	DDA vs. RAVI KUMAR GUPTA [D.No.40310/2022]
116.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAM SINGH [D.No. 13594/2023]
117.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SARLA KATARIA [D.No.13738/2023]
118.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. BATI [D. No. 15531/2023]
119.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NARESH SEHRAWAT [D. No.14854/2023]
120.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR (SOUTH) vs. RAVI KUMAR GUPTA [D. No. 15544/2023]
121.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. J.P. GUPTA [D.No.30619/2023]
122.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. DHARAMPAL [D.No. 28055/2022]
123.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MANPREET SINGH [D.No. 31966/2023]
124.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. UDAI PAL SINGH [D. No. 32408/2022]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

125.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RIZWAN AHMED [D. No. 37246/2022]
126.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAI CHAND [D. No. 35924/2022]
127.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAI BHAGWAN [D.No.35093/2023]
128.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. FARHANA SARFRAAZ [D.No. 17829/2023]
129.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KHUSHI KHAN [D. No. 15535/2023]
130.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SATPAL SINGH [D.No. 17832/2023]
131.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SUNANDA DEVI SARAF [D. No. 15542/2023]
132.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT Vs S. HARROOP SINGH SURI [D.No.35480/2023]
133.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. OM PRAKASH [D.No.14860/2023]
134.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SHIV LAL [D. No. 18111/2023]
135.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PREM SHARMA [D. No.13991/2023]
136.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR (SOUTH) vs. ARUN PATHAK [D.No.14692/2023]
137.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SADDIQ [D.No.14703/2023]
138.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BAL KISHAN [D.No.14751/2023]
139.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MANISH [D.No.14745/2023]
140.	THE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARI PRAKASH [D.No.36156/2023]
141.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. J.C. GUPTA [D.No.40767/2022 MA]
142.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VEERA SINGH [D.No.40773/2022 MA]
143.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. MEENA S. GUPTA [D.No. 34804/2023]
144.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAI PAL [D.No.27415/2023 MA]
145.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HOOR BANO [D.No.14789/2023]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

146.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. TRILOK [D.No.14869/2023]
147.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAHENDRA KUMAR [D.No.15004/2023]
148.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. UMA SHANKAR SITANI [D. No. 15173/2023]
149.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARINDER KAUSHIK [D. No. 15177/2023]
150.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAHUL BHATIA [D.No.14797/2023]
151.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAI PRAKASH TYAGI [MA No. 628/2020]
152.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SURJAN SINGH [D.No.31028/2023]
153.	THE LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. POOJA GARG [D. No. 15284/2023]
154.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S NORTHERN INDIA PLYWOODS PVT. LTD [D. No. 15734/2023]
155.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SANJAY GAUR [D.No.28446/2022]
156.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SHRAVAN GUPTA [D. No. 15805/2023]
157.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJENDRA SINGH [D.No.31977/2023]
158.	GOVT. OF N.C.T. OF DELHI vs. SANDHYA WINDLASS [D. No. 31979/2022]
159.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAVI NANDA [D.No. 35484/2023]
160.	LT. GOVERNOR vs. RITA MARWAH [D. No. 35488/2023]
161.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. NARESH SEHRAWAT [D. No. 31968/2023]
162.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJENDER SINGH CHAUHAN [D. No. 41349/2023]
163.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. APOORV JAIN [D. No. 15806/2023]
164.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. BEENA GUPTA [D. No. 31969/2023]
165.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ABHA DUTTA [D. No. 31974/2023]
166.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. INDER RAJ KOHLI [D. No. 15812/2023]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

167.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AMAN [D. No. 15815/2023]
168.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. HARMONY PROPERTIES PVT. LTD. [D. No. 14353/2023]
169.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DEWAN HARBHAGWAN AND NANDA (HUF) [D. No. 14289/2023]
170.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. RAKESH BANSAL [D. No. 15816/2023]
171.	UNION OF INDIA THROUGH LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR (WEST), NEW DELHI vs. SH. SAHAB SINGH [D. No. 30089/2023]
172.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJEEV KHANNA [D. No. 15819/2023]
173.	GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI vs. RADHEY SHYAM [D. No. 42660/2022]
174.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRAVEEN KHURANA [D. No. 15864/2023]
175.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJIV CHOUDHRI HUF [D. No. 4967/2023]
176.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAHENDER SINGH [D. No. 42745/2022]
177.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. LALITA GOGIA [D. No. 16246/2023]
178.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAI SINGH [D. No. 16975/2023]
179.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SUDERSHAN KUMAR KOHLI [D. No. 17063/2023]
180.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARUN MEHRA [D. No. 14584/2023]
181.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARUN MEHRA [D. No. 14601/2023]
182.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. EMMSONS INTERNATIONAL LTD. [D. No. 13420/2023]
183.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ANANT RAM [D. No. 31074/2023]
184.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MANOJ BAWA [D. No. 31971/2023]
185.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VINOD KUMAR LUTHRA [D.No. 4990/2023]
186.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PUNEET SPALL [D.No. 6510/2023]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

187.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAKESH [DIARY NO 6523/2023]
188.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAVI NANDA [D.No. 17124/2023]
189.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR / SDM vs. SHANTI INDIA (P) LTD. [D.No. 17208/2023]
190.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. BAND BOX PRIVATE LTD. [D.No. 33298/2023]
191.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KANWAL JAIN [D.No. 40386/2023]
192.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARY vs. RANVIR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 016016/2021]
193.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT, vs. JAGMEL SINGH [D.No. 26635/2018]
194.	DELHI-DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BHAGIRATH LAL MITTAL [D.No. 8141/2023]
195.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MANJEET SINGH [D.No. 9591/2023]
196.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BHAGWAN [D.No. 18034/2022]
197.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAWAHAR LAL CHHABRA [D. No. 6524/2023]
198.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VED WATI [D.No. 27410/2023]
199.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRITAM [D. No. 15738/2023]
200.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SAT PRAKASH SHARMA [D. No. 3958/2023]
201.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGBIR [D.No. 21344/2023]
202.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. TARLOK SINGH [D.No. 1136/2023]
203.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DHANNU [SLP(C) No. 004873 - / 2018]
204.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. CHANCHAL MITTAL [D. No. 4841/2023]
205.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SUDESH MALVIYA [D. No. 32916/2023]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

206.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. VED PRAKASH GAUR [D. No. 41084/2022]
207.	DELHI ADMINISTRATION (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) vs. RAVINDER SINGH [D. No. 41531/2022]
208.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SUDHIR SHUKLA [D.No. 41675/2023]
209.	THE LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. MUKHTYAR SINGH [D. No. 41703/2022]
210.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KISHAN CHAND [D. No. 41774/2022]
211.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KISHAN CHAND [D.No. 41777/2022]
212.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. MAHAVEER [D.No. 8250/2023]
213.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KUSHAL KUMAR GOGA [D. No. 24674/2022]
214.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DEVESH CHHABRA [D.No. 1291/2023]
215.	DDA vs. ALLIMUDDIN [D.No. 527/2023]
216.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MANZOOR UL HAQ [D. No. 41008/2023]
217.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DEW DROPS PROPERTIES PVT. LTD. [D.No. 668/2023]
218.	GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI vs. PUSHPA AGGARWAL [D. No. 42045/2022]
219.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SUBHASH GUPTA [D. No. 29697/2022]
220.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DEVI SINGH MATHUR (DEAD) [D. No. 29641/2022]
221.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. M/S GAURAV WELDMESH PVT. LTD [D.No. 32234/2023]
222.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. JAGBIR SINGH [D. No. 31083/2023]
223.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. CHAMAN SINGH [D. No. 1015/2023]
224.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANSAR AHMED [D.No. 446/2023]
225.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. BUNTI BAHRI [DIARY NO 39704/2023]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

226.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SHYAM SUNDER KANDOI [DIARY NO 18183/2023]
227.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. LALIT KUMAR [DIARY NO 16723/2023]
228.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AJAB SINGH [D. No. 15558/2023]
229.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. M/S REPUTE LAND AND LEASING PVT. LTD. [D. No. 15550/2023]
230.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. RAM CHANDER [D. No. 10339/2023]
231.	GOVT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI vs. NARINDER NATH [D. No. 32409/2022]
232.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGH ITS SECRETARY vs. SAROJ BALA [D. No. 38874/2023]
233.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI VS. CHHOTE LAL [D. No. 39771/2023]
234.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI VS. KARAN SINGH [D. No. 3760/2022]
235.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. RAMESH [D. No. 37258/2023]
236.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. KIRAN RAI [D. No. 4477/2023]
237.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR/A.D.M. VS. MANPREET SINGH [D. No. 13549/2023]
238.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. ALLIMUDDIN (D) BY LRS. [D. No. 541/2023]
239.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. JAI BHAGWAN YADAV [MA No. 627/2020]
240.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY THROUGH ITS VICE CHAIRMAN vs. OM PRAKASH [SLP(C) No. 33345/2015]
241.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MEHBOOB [D. No. 21786/2023]
242.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUSHIL KUMAR JAIN [D. No. 11706/2023]
243.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MUKHTYAR SINGH [D.No.11554/2023]
244.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M. SALIM [D. No. 11562/2023]
245.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JASWANT SINGH [D. No. 12238/2022]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

246.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SURESH KUMAR NANGIA [D.No.24734/2021]
247.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. ARVIND KUMAR SHARMA [D. No. 42064/2022]
248.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARVIND KUMAR SHARMA [D.No. 42071/2022]
249.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ISHWAR SINGH (D) THR. LRS. [D.No.24734/2023]
250.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. KRISHAN KANT GOYAL [D. No. 42406/2022]
251.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. KRISHAN KANT GOYAL [42459/2022]
252.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAI KISHAN GOEL [D. No. 3484/2023]
253.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAHESH RAHEJA [D.No. 12526/2023]
254.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. CHANDER SAIN [D.No.12548/2023]
255.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. PREM SHARMA [D. No. 3578/2023]
256.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAHENDER SINGH [D. No. 12592/2023]
257.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARCHANA KHANNA [D. No. 12635/2023]
258.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARCHANA KHANNA [D. No. 12639/2023]
259.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. TEJPAL SINGH [D.No. 34835/2023]
260.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. TEJPAL SINGH [D.No.34776/2023 MA]
261.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KHAZANI AND ORS. [D. No. 17744/2023]
262.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Vs. SANJAY SINGH [D No. 22699/2023]
263.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GURBAKSHISH SINGH BATRA [D. No. 12549/2023]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.***List C: Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications******List C.1: Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications
primarily pleading change of law***

S. No.	Case Title
1.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAHENDER SINGH [D. No. 12596/2023]
2.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. DEVINDER SINGH. [DIARY NO. - 13155/2023]
3.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. AJAY SINGHAL [DIARY NO. - 4242/2023]
4.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GOVERDHAN [MA 1626/2023]
5.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHISH PAUL [MA 1761/2023]
6.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANIL KUMAR [MA 700/2020]
7.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KUSHAM JAIN [MA No. 001642 / 2023]
8.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KUSHAM JAIN [MA No. 001643 /2023]
9.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. UDAY SINGH [MA No. 45/2023]
10.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ISHWAR SINGH [D.No. 37093/2022]
11.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ISHWAR SINGH [D.No.37562/2022]
12.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KAILASH KUMAR DILWALI (DECEASED) [D. No. 28634/2018]
13.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NARESH SEHRAWAT [D.No.14845/2023]
14.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHOK KUMAR [D.No.4510/2023]
15.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. S. HARCHARAN SINGH [D.No.14180/2023]
16.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. K.L. RATHI STEELS LTD. [D. No. 29714/2018]
17.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHOK KUMAR [D. No. 4743/2023]
18.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AJIT SINGH [MA No. 001416/2019]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

19.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VIJAY DHALL [D.No. 2941/2023]
20.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJIV CHOUDHRIE (HUF) [D.No. 30749/2021]
21.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. JAI KISHAN GOEL [DIARY NO. - 4367/2023]
22.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH PRINCIPAL SECRETARY VS. MOHAN LAL GANDHI [D. No. 26490/2019]
23.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. NEENA WADHWA [D. No. 19545/2022]
24.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. BALBIR SINGH [MA No. 1267/2019]
25.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. DARYAO SINGH [MA No. 525/2020]
26.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. SHER SINGH [MA No. 611/2020]
27.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. RAM GARHIA SABHA [MA No. 804/2020]
28.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. GOVERDHAN [MA No. 1625/2023]
29.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. MAHENDER SINGH [D. NO. - 42742/2022]
30.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. DEWAN CHAND PRUTHI [MA 1919 - / 2023]

List C.2: Review Petitions and Miscellaneous Applications filed before [Shailendra](#) (supra) and/or not primarily pleading change of law

S. No.	Case Title
1.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJESH WADHWA [R.P.(C) No. 002438/2017]
2.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VED PRAKASH [R.P.(C)No.1637/2017]
3.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NEELAM SRIVASTAVA [R.P.(C) No. 1882/ 2017]
4.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAMPHAL SINGH [D.No. 17789/2017]
5.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PUNEET LAKRA [R.P.(C) No. 1/2018]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.***List D: Leave granted in previous SLP*****List D.1: Previous SLP dismissed after granting leave**

S. No.	Case Title
1.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAVI [D. No. 21004/2022]
2.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJESH WADHWA [D. No. 20979/2022]
3.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. RAM BABU [D. No. 38004/2023]
4.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAKESH KUMAR JAIN [D. No. 3172/2022]
5.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI SECRETARY vs. PUNEET SPALL [D. No. 7174/2018]
6.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. LALIT KUMAR GOEL [D. No. 19415/2021]
7.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ANCHAL PROPERTIES PVT. LTD. [D. No. 2407/2022]
8.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARISH SAWHNEY [D. No. 4601/2023]
9.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. KAPTAN SINGH [D. No. 20986/2022]
10.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH THE SECRETARY vs. MANGE RAM [D. No. 7178/2018]
11.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SHASHI KANT GOENKA [D. No. 21006/2022]
12.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. NARENDER KUMAR [D. No. 21052/2022]
13.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ANSAR AHMED [D. No. 21072/2022]
14.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. TILAK RAJ [D. No. 4587/2023]
15.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ZIKRU REHMAN KHATRI [D.No. 10477/2022]
16.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KISHAN CHAND AND ORS [SLP(C) No. 4155 / 2017]
17.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SHRI. CHAND OF NCT OF DELHI [D. No. 22630/2021]
18.	THE LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. CHARANJIT KAUR [SLP(C) No. 8320/2019]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

19.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. GIRISH KUMAR [D. No.7087/2023]
20.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI SECRETARY vs. DIWAN CHAND [D. No.7167/2018]
21.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AJIT SINGH [SLP(C) No. 022996 / 2015]
22.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RANVIR [D.No. 24253/2020]
23.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. LUV MALHOTRA [D.No. 13554/2023]
24.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. M/S RYAN CONSTRUCTION PVT. LTD. [D. No. 24491/2020]
25.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. JITENDER KUMAR CHURAMANI [D.No.38890/2022]
26.	THE SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. S. SOHAN SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LR [D.No.15170/2021]
27.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR vs. RAJINDER SINGH [D.No.27649/2022]
28.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJAN ANAND [D.No.29111/2021]
29.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MUKESH JAIN [D.No.17613/2021]
30.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ATTRO DEVI [SLP(C) No. 1928/2020]
31.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ISHWAR SINGH [D.No. 28956/2020]
32.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. BHAG RATI [D.No. 29678/2022]
33.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VED PRAKASH [D.No.27959/2022]
34.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJESH KHANNA [D.No.27975/2022]
35.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DEEN MOHAMMAD DEENU [D.No.28053/2022]
36.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. DEVENDER KUMAR [D.No. 18136/2021]
37.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAGBIR SINGH [D. No. 28988/2020]
38.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VIJENDER SINGH [D. No. 15687/2022]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

39.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VIJENDER KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 13774/2022]
40.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SHIREEN SUBRAMANYA [D. No. 29310/2022]
41.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. MAHENDER SINGH [SLP(C). No. 13933/2022]
42.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. NEELAM SRIVASTAVA [D. No. 42036/2022]
43.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SHER SINGH [D. No. 14597/2022]
44.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DINESH GAUTAM [D. No. 29650/2022]
45.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AJIT SINGH [D.No. 17211/2023]
46.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI SECRETARY vs. TARUN KAPAH I [D.No. 7184/2018]
47.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. NEENA NARANG [D.No. 7188/2018]
48.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SUKHVIR SINGH [D.No. 7195/2018]
49.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. UDAY SINGH [D.No. 7291/2023]
50.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SURAJ PRAKASH BATRA [D.No. 8454/2021]
51.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI VS. MANGAT RAM [DIARY NO. - 28993/2020]
52.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HANIF [D.No. 10218/2022]
53.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI VS. RATANI KAUL (DEAD) [D. No. 17118/2021]
54.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAGBIR [D. No. 27923/2022]
55.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANKIT BANSAL [SLP(C) No. 8765/2016]
56.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI vs. KAILASH KUMAR DILWALI (DEAD) THROUGH LRS [D. No. 29548/2021]
57.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR vs. BALBIR SINGH [D.No. 381/2022]
58.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. POONAM SAWHNEY [D.No.501/2023]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

List D.2 Previous SLP allowed after granting leave

S. No.	Case Title
1.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PAWAN SAGAR JAIN [D. No. 937/2023]
2.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KARAMPAL [SLP (C) No. 2878/2018]
3.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DEVENDER KUMAR GUPTA [D. No. 21692/2019]
4.	DELHI ADMINISTRATION LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SUDARSHAN KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 22412/2019]
5.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RITU GUPTA [SLP(C) No.8773/2016]
6.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGH SECRETARY GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KANTA GUPTA [D.No. 8526/2018]
7.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MANJEET SINGH [D. No. 29668/2021]
8.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VIKASH [SLP(C) No. 22808/2019]
9.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RATI RAM [SLP(C) No. 020207/2018]
10.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SARDAR MOHAMMAD [SLP(C) No. 20210/2018]
11.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RATIRAM [D.No.15399/2021]
12.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MANJEET KAUR [SLP(C) No. 2260/2020]
13.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. SHIV RAJ [D.No. 29096/2021]
14.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ASHA PRAKASH [D.No. 28682/2021]
15.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. JAI PAL [SLP(C) No. 003065 - 003066 / 2018]
16.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. VED WATI [SLP(C) No. 003056-003057 /2018]
17.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AJAY SINGH [SLP(C) No. 026089/2018]
18.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GAJINDER [D.No.31393/2021]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

19.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJ SINGH [SLP(C) No. 026393/2018]
20.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KRISHNA [D. No. 30585/2021]
21.	EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION vs. ROHIT JAIN [SLP(C) No. 002264 / 2020]
22.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUNIL KUMAR DHANKAR [SLP(C) No. 815/2020]
23.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DHARAMVIR [SLP(C) No. 29192/2019]

List E: Leave not granted in previous SLP

List E.1: No previous SLP/leave not granted in previous SLP, notice issued on delay, but no notice issued on merits in the present SLP

S. No.	Case Title
1.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. GURBAKSHISH SINGH BATRA [D. No. 9201/2022]
2.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. BIJIT SEHGAL [D. No. 3096/2022]

List E.2: No previous SLP/leave not granted in previous SLP, notice on merits issued in the present SLP, and [Manoharlal \(supra\)](#) test applicable

S. No.	Case Title
1.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HARISH CHANDER (DEAD) [D. No. 1698/2021]
2.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. KANWAR SINGH (DEAD) [SLP(C) No. 4073 - / 2020]
3.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. DEEP CHAND [DIARY NO. 53/2021]
4.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. IQBAL AHMED [D. No. 3283/2023]
5.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BALRAJ [D. No. 118/2021]
6.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SATYA DEV SINGH BIDHURI [D. No. 4531/2023]
7.	UNION OF INDIA vs. CHARAN SINGH [SLP (C) 14207/2022]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

8.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MOHAN LAL [D. No.57/2020]
9.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAFIQ AHMED [SLP(C) No. 14200/2022]
10.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VIJAY MOHAN [D. No. 19172/2019]
11.	EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION vs. GOBIND RAM ARORA [D. No. 45830/2019]
12.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAM KISHAN [D. No. 12518/2022]
13.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DUNGER SINGH TOKAS [D. No. 12519/2022]
14.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. INDRAJ [D.No. 20620/2022]
15.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAM KRISHNA [D. No. 12377/2022]
16.	LT. GOVERNOR OF DELHI vs. GOBIND RAM ARORA [D. No. 4265/2023]
17.	UNION OF INDIA vs. SHIV KUMAR [D. No. 1204/2023]
18.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AJIT KUMAR @ AJIT KUMAR CHAUDHARY [12203/2022]
19.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SATVIR [D.No. 39067/2022]
20.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANIL KUMAR JAIN (DEAD) [D. No. 21380/2019]
21.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJINDER KUMAR GUPTA [D.No. 21381/2019]
22.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SAROJ BALA [D. No. 21382/2019]
23.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VIPIN CHUGH [D. No. 21741/2019]
24.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SATBIR SINGH MALIK [21831/2021]
25.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SATYA DEV SINGH BIDHURI [SLP (C) No. 10948/2019]
26.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AJIT KUMAR CHAWLA [SLP(C) No.11135/2023]
27.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PADMA MAHANT [D. No. 21920/2021]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

28.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. YUDHVIR SINGH [D. No. 10284/2022]
29.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BATTI [SLP(C) No. 22854/2019]
30.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NATHI SINGH [SLP(C) 21275/2018]
31.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DUNGER SINGH TOKAS (DEAD) THROUGH LRS [D. No. 21978/2022]
32.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. B.M. PROPERTIES [SLP(C) No. 584 / 2017]
33.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAVINDER KUMAR [D. No. 22116/2020]
34.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGH SECRETARY vs. NATHI SINGH [D. No. 22128/2021]
35.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUNANDA JAIN [SLP(C) No. 4298 /2017]
36.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SIMLA DEVI [D. No. 22256/2021]
37.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRITAM SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS [D. No. 1377/2022]
38.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AZHAR AHMED [D. No. 1456/2019]
39.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KASHI RAM [SLP(C) No. 20205/2018]
40.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. MAHENDER SINGH [SLP(C) No.20204/2018]
41.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. JAGBIR [D. No. 4029/2020]
42.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. ANGURI DEVI [SLP(C) No. 14851/2020]
43.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAMPAL [SLP(C) 14777/2020]
44.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NIRANJAN SINGH [SLP(C) No. 6519/2020]
45.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUSHIL BANSAL (D) THROUGH LRS. [SLP(C) No. 8769/2016]
46.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DHANWAN SINGH [SLP(C) No.6568/2020]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

47.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PAWAN KUMAR [SLP(C) No.5910/2016]
48.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VEENA JAIN [SLP(C) No.8775/2016]
49.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. M/S PARAM EXPORT AND CONSTRUCTION PVT. LTD. [SLP(C) No. 7909/2023]
50.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAI KISHAN GUPTA [SLP(C) No. 10946/2019]
51.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ROOP CHAND VASHISHT [SLP(C) No. 7948/2019]
52.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT SECRETARY vs. M/S INSPIRATION ENGINEER PVT. LTD [D. No. 8479/2018]
53.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRATAP SINGH [SLP(C) No. 7949/2019]
54.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHOK KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 10384/2019]
55.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RITA MARWAH [SLP(C) No. 9061/2019]
56.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MANJU SHARMA [SLP(C) No. 10169/2016]
57.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAMESH CHANDER DABAS [SLP(C) No. 10386/2019]
58.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BALWANT SINGH [SLP(C) No. 10154/2019]
59.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGDEV SINGH [SLP(C) No. 11164/2019]
60.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S KAMLA DEVI MEMORIAL EDUCATIONAL WELFARE AND CHARITABLE SOCIETY [SLP(C) No. 3060/2018]
61.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ANGURI DEVI [SLP(C) No.30101/2018]
62.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DUNGER SINGH TOKAS (DECEASED) [SLP(C) 29611/2018]
63.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJENDER SINGH [SLP(C) No. 22340/2019]
64.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ATTAR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 26698/2019]
65.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAHIPAL [SLP(C) No. 18/2020]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

66.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR vs. SUKHBIR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 10674/2020]
67.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. INDRA DEVI [SLP(C) No. 29831/2018]
68.	UNION OF INDIA vs. GURCHARAN SINGH [SLP(C) No. 21759/2019]
69.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJ KUMAR [D. No. 39904/2022]
70.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJ SINGH [SLP(C) No. 022434/2019]
71.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. UDAI SINGH [SLP(C) No. 21758/2019]
72.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. LOV RAM [SLP(C) No. 5308/2020]
73.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. CHARAN SINGH [SLP(C) No. 22033/2019]
74.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) THROUGH ITS MANAGER vs. HARI SINGH [SLP(C) No. 003071 - 003072 / 2018]
75.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAMJAS FOUNDATION [SLP(C) No. 020458 - / 2018]
76.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. RAJ SINGH [SLP(C) No. 3047- 3048/ 2018]
77.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. ROHTASH [SLP(C) No. 003043 - 003044 / 2018]
78.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. CHETAK DABAS [SLP(C) No. 003052 - 003053/2018]
79.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. KANHAIYA LAL [SLP(C) No.3054-3055 /2018]
80.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RANDHIR SINGH (DEAD BY LRS.) [SLP(C) No.32417/2018]
81.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJINDER KUMAR [SLP(C) No.702/2020]
82.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. VINAY BHASIN [SLP(C) No.4110/2020]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

83.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SAMO [D.No. 24247/2020]
84.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR vs. SHIV KUMAR THROUGH GURNAM SINGH KOCHHAR [D. No. 30121/2022]
85.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SAMAY SINGH [DIARY NO. 9555/2021]
86.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. LALIT KUMAR SHARMA [D.No.4276/2021]
87.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. RAJKUMARI KHANDELWAL [D.No.24368/2020]
88.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. OM PRAKASH [D. No. 11493/2022]
89.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RATAN SINGH [D.No. 24494/2020]
90.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GANESH SETH [D.No. 38278/2022]
91.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. POOJA GARG [SLP(C) No. 20798/2019]
92.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRAKASH [SLP(C) No. 28212/2018]
93.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. ARUN DAYAL [D. No.24631/2020]
94.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HUKUM SINGH [SLP(C) No. 029144 - / 2018]
95.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SATPAL [SLP(C) No. 22847/2019]
96.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KELA DEVI [SLP(C) No.6029/2020]
97.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KAMAL KUMAR JAIN [SLP(C) No. 2272/2019]
98.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJESH SAINI [SLP(C) No. 020209/2018]
99.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SURESH KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 22851/2019]
100.	EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION vs. INDER RAJ KOHLI [D. No. 46016/2019]
101.	UNION OF INDIA vs. YUDHVIR SINGH [D. No. 28686/2021]
102.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAM PRASAD [SLP(C) No. 22864/2019]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

103.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SATBIR SINGH MALIK [SLP(C) No. 20206/2018]
104.	EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION vs. S.HARROOP SINGH SURI [D.No.46004/2019]
105.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. NIRMALA [SLP(C) No. 16015/2021]
106.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PREM RANI @ PREM SAIM [D.No.29803/2021]
107.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DAYA RAM MITTAL [SLP(C) No. 020459/2018]
108.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AZAD SINGH [D.No. 27769/2022]
109.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MOHD. MAQBOOL [D.No.28141/2021]
110.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAI BHAGWAN [SLP(C) No. 028277 / 2016]
111.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KRISHAN [SLP(C) No. 27464/2019]
112.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SATPAL [SLP(C) No. 022115/2018]
113.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. KAMAL KANT BANSAL [D.No. 29098/2021]
114.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. PHOOL SINGH [D.No.28960/2020]
115.	UNION OF INDIA vs. CHET RAM [D. No. 29097/2021]
116.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. BALJEET SINGH [SLP(C) No. 003061-003062/2018]
117.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAHENDER SINGH [D.No. 31839/2021]
118.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. JAGMEL SINGH (DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS. [SLP(C) No. 003063 - 003064/2018]
119.	EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION vs. SARDAR GURBAX SINGH [D.No.45820/2019]
120.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KULDEEP SINGH [D.No.29182/2021]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

121.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S AMAR IRON STORE [17929/2022]
122.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Vs KARAN SINGH [SLP(C) No. 22688/2018]
123.	EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION vs. DES RAJ ARORA [D.No.45825/2019]
124.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. NEERAJ KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 3067-3068/2018]
125.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. MANOHAR LAL [SLP(C) No. 13889/2022]
126.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. NIRMALA [SLP(C) No.3041-3042/2018]
127.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI Vs MAHARAJ SINGH (DEAD) [D.No.14006/2023]
128.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GAJRAJ [SLP(C) No.12601/2019]
129.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HARISH CHAND [SLP(C) No. 28442/2018]
130.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. RANVIR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 003058 - 003059/2018]
131.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SWARUP NARAIN BHATNAGAR [D.No.28110/2021]
132.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. IQBAL AHMED [D. No. 28767/2021]
133.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. NEERAJ KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 29191/2019]
134.	EAST DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION vs. GURCHARAN SINGH [SLP(C) No. 4923/2020]
135.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJESH SAXENA [SLP(C) No. 12600/2019]
136.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. (DSIIDC) vs. RAN SINGH [SLP(C) No. 016350/2018]
137.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. (DSIIDC) vs. KRISHAN [SLP(C) No. 016349/2018]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

138.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. (DSIIDC) vs. SATPAL SINGH [SLP(C) No. 016348/2018]
139.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. (DSIIDC) vs. AJIT SINGH [SLP(C) No. 016351/2018]
140.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. (DSIIDC) vs. HARKESH [SLP(C) No. 16352/2018]
141.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. (DSIIDC) vs. SARJO [SLP(C) No. 016353/2018]
142.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. (DSIIDC) vs. SANJAY SINGH [SLP(C) No. 025394/2018]
143.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. BALJEET SINGH [SLP(C) No. 21608/2022]
144.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PHOOL SINGH (DEAD) [D.No.29032/2021]
145.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KARTAR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 1382/2019]
146.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARMAN JASPAL [D.No.30583/2021]
147.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJENDER SINGH [C.A. No. 1012/2017]
148.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHOK KUMAR [C.A. No. 001013/2017]
149.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) vs. TRIPAT KAUR [SLP(C) No. 228/ 2019]
150.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. DEVENDER KUMAR [D. No. 41445/2022]
151.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AZHAR AHMED [SLP(C) No. 32416/2018]
152.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGBIR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 31862 / 2018]
153.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PREM RAJ [SLP(C) No. 003991/2020]
154.	UNION OF INDIA vs. DHRUV BHASIN [D. No. 15896/2019]
155.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NAFE SINGH [SLP(C). No. 5347/2019]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

156.	UNION OF INDIA LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR vs. ROOP CHAND VASHISHT [SLP(C) No. 16233/2018]
157.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PUNAM LAUL (DEAD) THROUGH LRS. [SLP(C) No. 15346/2015]
158.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGWANT SINGH [SLP(C) No. 029159/2018]
159.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RATI RAM [SLP(C) No. 028439/2018]
160.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARISH CHAND LOHIYA DECEASED THROUGH SHRI SATISH CHAND GUPTA [D.No. 26807/2021]
161.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PADAM CHAND KANODIA [D. No. 6926/2020]
162.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AMAR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 015071/2019]
163.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAJINDER KUMAR GUPTA [D.No. 17418/2021]
164.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SANJAY SINGH [D.No. 26601/2021]
165.	LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR (NORTH EAST) vs. GANPATI ROLLING (P) LTD [D.No. 7350/2023]
166.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARI SINGH [D. No. 26605/2021]
167.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHU [SLP(C) No. 018861/2023]
168.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT THR. ITS SECRETARY GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. KAMAL KANT BANSAL [SLP(C) No. 023373/2018]
169.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KARAM SINGH [D. No. 8470/2020]
170.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAL KAUR EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY [D. No. 8804/2020]
171.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. SHRI RAMI [D. No. 9194/2023]
172.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. OM PRAKASH [D. No. 10043/2021]
173.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HARI RAM (SINCE DECEASED) THR LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE PADAM KUMAR [D. No. 22098/2019]
174.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. DURGA PRASAD PATODIA [D. No. 28449/2022]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

175.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SHIV KUMAR [D. No. 2/2022]
176.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. HARKESH [D.No.28978/2021]
177.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. TIKA RAM [SLP(C) No. 14776/2020]
178.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. M/S. DELHI HOUSE SOCIETY (REGD.) [SLP(C) No. 004299 / 2017]
179.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAGHUVAR SINGH [D.No. 2001/2021]
180.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HARDEEP SINGH CHAHAL [SLP(C) No. 8797/ 2016]
181.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. T.R. GUPTA [SLP(C) No. 008761 / 2016]
182.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PREM LATA GUPTA [SLP(C) No. 008776 / 2016]
183.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SANDEEP MITTAL [SLP(C) No. 008766 / 2016]
184.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PREMWATI [SLP(C) No. 008791 / 2016]
185.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHEY RAM @ ASHA RAM [D.No. 5024/2022]
186.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SARABJEET KAUR [D. No. 28547/2021]
187.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. JAYBIR [D. No. 28987/2020]
188.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJESH AGGARWAL [SLP(C) No. 031868/2018]
189.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KULDEEP SINGH [D.No.41709/2019]
190.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHISH SINGH [SLP(C) 4399/2019]
191.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. HARSH GUPTA [C.A. No. 005538 / 2017]
192.	DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD (DSIIDC) THROUGH ITS MANAGER vs. RAVI KUMAR [SLP(C) No. 003069 - 003070/2018]
193.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. RANDHIR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 032415/2018]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

194.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ALEP KAUR [SLP(C) No. 3743/2019]
195.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. IQBAL AHMED [SLP(C) No. 031869- / 2018]
196.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. REKHA [D. No. 2927/2021]
197.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AZAD SINGH [SLP(C) No. 032414 - / 2018]
198.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. NIRMALA JAIN [D. No. 25769/2020]
199.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PUNAM LAUL [D. No. 7087/2022]
200.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ATTAR SINGH [DIARY NO 9841/2022]
201.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. GAJRAJ [SLP(C) No. 031309 / 2018]
202.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AJIT SINGH MANN [SLP(C) No. 5812/2019]
203.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BHAGRATI [SLP(C) No. 031861 / 2018]
204.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SATWANT SINGH [SLP(C) No. 012155 -/2019]
205.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PREM SINGH [SLP(C) No. 20908/2019]
206.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ARUN MEHRA [SLP(C) No. 006457 -/2019]
207.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. SUDHIR KUMAR YADAV [SLP(C) No. 22859/2019]
208.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PYARE LAL SAFAYA [SLP(C) No. 002463/ 2020]
209.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. BRIJ MOHAN [SLP(C) No. 3407/ 2020]
210.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. MAAN SINGH [SLP(C) No.8323/2019]
211.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. ASHOK KUMAR AGGARWAL [SLP(C) No.3420/2020]
212.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. POONAM YADAV [SLP(C) No.3989/2020]

Delhi Development Authority v. Tejpal & Ors.

213.	PRINCIPAL SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. ROHTASH [SLP(C) No. 947 / 2020]
214.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. RAJ SINGH [SLP(C) No.4251/2020]
215.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. BRAHAM PRAKASH YADAV [SLP(C) No. 27211/2019]
216.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. AJAB SINGH [SLP(C) No.4077/2020]
217.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. LOV RAM [SLP(C) No.2259/2020]
218.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SECRETARY vs. VIKRAM MATHUR [SLP(C) No.937/2020]
219.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. USHA PIR [SLP(C) No. 28645/2019]
220.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. VEENA JAIN [SLP(C) No. 12894/2019]
221.	DELHI ADMINISTRATION THROUGH SECRETARY LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT vs. RAJINDER KUMAR [D. No. 4034/2020]
222.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. JAGBIR [SLP(C) 002876/2018]
223.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. KARTARI DEVI(D) THROUGH HER LEGAL HEIRS [D. No. SLP(C) 2034/2019]
224.	GOVT. OF NCT DELHI VS. NIHAL SINGH (DEAD) THROUGH LRS [D. No. 24353/2022]
225.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY VS. DAYA CHAND [D. No. 7493/2020]
226.	DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY vs. PRITAM KAUR (D) THR. LRS. [C.A. No. 8565/2016]
227.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI VS. ISHWAR SINGH [SLP(C) No. 14870/2020]
228.	GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. AMAN [SLP(C) No. 18608/2022]
229.	GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI vs. RAHUL BHATIA [D.No.28059/2022]
230.	KRISHNA KHANDELWAL vs. UNION OF INDIA [SLP (C) No. 14569/2019]
231.	JAGBIR SINGH vs. UNION OF INDIA [SLP (C) No. 019817 -/2018]
232.	V.P. CHAUDHARY vs. DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY [D. No. 21033/2022]

Digital Supreme Court Reports

List E.3: No previous SLP/leave not granted in previous SLP, notice issued on merits in the present SLP, [Manoharlal](#) (supra) test not applicable

S. No.	Case Title
1.	GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI vs. PYARE LAL SAFAYA [D. No. 5385/2023]
2.	THE LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT NATIONAL CAPITAL OF DELHI vs. ARCHANA GUPTA [D. No. 14829/2021]
3.	LAND AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT THROUGH SECRETARY vs. SIMLA DEVI [SLP (C) No. 29190/2019]

Result of the case: Appeals disposed of.

[†]*Headnotes prepared by:* Divya Pandey