



\$~36

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 316/2026 & CM APPL. 1483/2026, CM APPL. 1484/2026**
NASIR & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. J Sai Deepak Sr. Adv, with
Mr.Pawanjeet Singh Bindra, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. AvishkarSinghvi, Mr. Gaurav
Kumar, Mr. Rahul, Ms. Purnima,
Ms.Tanushka Agrawal, Ms. Salini
Sukumaran and Ms. Divya Prabha
Singh, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Malvika Kapil and Mr. Govind
Kumar, Advs.
Mr. Nishant Gautam CGSC, Mr.
Vardhman Kaushik, Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Advs.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Standing
Counsel with Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha
and Mr. M. S. Akhtar, Advs. for R3 &
R4.
Mr. Surjeet Singh, G.P.

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER
% **09.01.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioners namely
Petitioner No.1-Mr. Nasir, Petitioner No. 2-Adarsh Enclave Vikas Samiti
Resident Welfare Association (*hereinafter*, 'RWA'), Petitioner No.3- Mr.
Asif and Petitioner No.4- Mr. Idris under Article 226 of the Constitution of
India, *inter alia*, seeking issuance of an appropriate writ declaring the Award



No. 14/87-88 pertaining to lands in Village Satbari as invalidated due to non-payment of compensation to the landowners and also because the amount which was allocated for payment of compensation has been withdrawn.

3. At the outset, this Court notices that of the four Petitioners, three are individuals and one is an RWA. The status of these Petitioners is unclear as to in what capacity they have filed the present petition, whether as land owners or as residents, and in any case an RWA cannot challenge the land acquisition.

4. Let an affidavit be filed by the Petitioners furnishing clearer particulars, with the following details:

(i) The *Khasra* Nos. in respect of which the present challenge has been raised by the Petitioners;

(ii) The right of the Petitioners in the lands comprised in aforesaid *Khasra* Nos.;

(iii) Any documents in support of the claims of the Petitioners.

5. Additionally, there is a letter dated 25th April, 2018 (*hereinafter*, '*letter*') which is referred to and relied upon by the Petitioners and has been obtained under RTI Act, 2005. The letter states that the amount of Rs.11,71,18,574.47/-, which was paid by the Delhi Development Authority (*hereinafter*, '*DDA*') to the Land Acquisition Collector (*hereinafter*, '*LAC*'), has been withdrawn in favor of self. The LAC shall clarify the actual meaning of the aforesaid document and whether the amount paid by the DDA has been withdrawn by the DDA or adjusted towards any other acquisition.

6. It is pointed out to the Court that there is an error in the description of



Respondent no. 3 in the memo of parties.

7. Let Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Id. SC furnish the correct description to the Petitioners and the amended memo of parties be filed by the Petitioners within a period of one week from this order.

8. List on 23rd March, 2026.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J

MADHU JAIN, J

JANUARY 9, 2026/*neha/b/sm*