

LAC No. 168/19
Raj Pal Dagar vs UOI

11.08.2021

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing via Cisco Webex.

Present: Sh. M.C. Verma, counsel for the petitioner.

Sh. Vinay Kumar, counsel for R-1/UOI.

Ms. Divya Sharma, counsel for DDA/R-2.

Counsel for R-2/DDA seeks one more opportunity to file the WS.

Perusal of the record reveals that despite given endless opportunities, R-2/DDA has not filed WS till date. No explanation is given as to why WS has not been filed till date. Therefore, the request is declined. The right of R-2/DDA to file the WS stands closed.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner does not want to file the replication to the WS of R-1. Accordingly, the right of the petitioner to file the same stands closed. He submits that the petitioner admits the statement u/s 19 of LAC Act.

On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues are hereby framed:-

1. Whether the petitioner is entitled to enhancement to the compensation amount, and if so, at what rate? OPP

2. Relief.

No further issue arises or pressed.

Put up for PE on 19.01.2022.

(Pankaj Gupta)
ADJ-1(North)/Rohini Courts
Delhi/11.08.2021

: 2 :

At this stage, one advocate appeared through VC and requested to mark his presence may be marked for R-2/DDA. It is noted that one counsel had appeared on behalf of R-2/DDA in the morning when the matter was being taken up. Accordingly, the request is declined.

(Pankaj Gupta)
ADJ-1(North)/Delhi/11.08.2021