

33
CS DJ
840/22
MEENA JAIN
Vs.
DEPUTY DIRECTOR LAND SALES
BRANCH(ROHINI)

30.05.2023

Present : Sh. Vaibhav Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Sh. Vishal Soni, Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 4
and the applicant.
Sh. Jatin Aggarwal and Sh. Shivam Mudgil, Ld.
Counsels for the defendant/ DDA.
Sh. Sunil, Ld. Proxy counsel for the defendant no. 3.
Sh. Achin Bansal, Ld. Proxy counsel for the
defendant no. 5.

Heard.

Put up for consideration at 02.00 pm.

(RUCHIKA SINGLA)
ADJ-03 (N/W)
Rohini Courts :Delhi/30.05.2023

At 02.00 pm

Present: None.

The status report not filed by the DDA today. It is submitted that some more time is sought as the DDA has to verify the record and as the documents are of a very old date. Further, Ld. Counsel submits that the DDA has to inspect the record to verify which documents are correct as there are two chains of the documents.

Same is opposed by Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 4 and the applicant. It is stated that the documents which are in the favour of the plaintiff are forged and the defendant no. 4 is suffering from the interim order which has been passed in the

present matter. The DDA only had to file the report as to which documents were genuine. The matter is being unnecessarily delayed by the DDA. Hence, the Director, DDA may be personally directed to appear in the court and file the report.

Record perused.

As submitted by Ld. Counsel for the defendant no.4, the DDA was directed only to file the status report regarding the ownership and the Conveyance Deed of the property. There are no such directions that the DDA has to inspect the record of some other department and to conduct an inquiry regarding the same. At the cost of repetition, the DDA is required to file a report only in respect of the documents which have been issued by it. Further, Ld. Counsel for the DDA had stated that the record was very old and some time was required but both the alleged Conveyance Deeds are dated 22.07.2021 and 07.07.2022. Hence, it is not an old record. The defendant no. 4 had also filed a letter dated 19.01.2023 purportedly issued by the DDA to the Sub-Registrar, Kanjhawala that the Conveyance Deed dated 22.07.2021 was not issued by the DDA. Hence, the court does not understand as to why so much time is being sought by the DDA to file a simple report. Hence, a cost of Rs. 10,000/- is imposed upon the DDA for unnecessarily delaying the present matter to be deposited in the DLSA fund, N/W.

Last and final opportunity is given to the DDA to file the report, failing which, the Director, DDA is directed to appear in person as to why the report is not being filed despite repeated directions.

It is submitted by Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff that the vakalatnama on behalf of the defendant no. 5 was not placed

-: 3 :-

on record. Defendant no. 5 is directed to file the same by NDOH.

Further, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff stated that he has already filed written arguments.

Now, to come up for further arguments on **06.06.2023.**

Interim order to continue, till the next date of hearing.

Copy of this order be sent to the Director, DDA today itself for information and compliance.

Ahlmad is directed to show the compliance report to the undersigned today itself by 04.00 pm.

**(RUCHIKA SINGLA)
ADJ-03 (N/W)
Rohini Courts :Delhi/30.05.2023**