



\$~27

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

+ W.P.(C) 4322/2023 and CM APPL. 16639/2023, CM APPL. 66265/2024

M/S RAAS CONTROLS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul Malhotra; Mr. Chirag Goyal, Advocates.

versus

DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND
INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION LIMITED & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Zainab Zehra Kazmi, Advocates
for R-1.

Ms. Vaishali Gupta, Panel Counsel (CIVIL) / GNCTD and Mr Kartik Sharma, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

18.02.2026

**CM APPL. 66265/2024 (FOR DIRECTION TO RESPONDENT NO.1
TO CONVERT THE PROPERTY FROM LEASEHOLD TO
FREEHOLD)**

1. In pursuance to the observations made by the Court *vide* order dated 14.01.2026, the respondent no. 1 has filed the affidavit. The paragraph nos. 3 to 6 of the same are extracted as under:

“3. That the present application has been filed by the Applicant/Petitioner seeking directions to the Respondents to process the application dated 06.02.2014 filed by the Applicant/Petitioner for conversion of Shed No. 44, Okhla Industrial Estate, Phase-III, New Delhi-110020 from leasehold to freehold.

4. That it is pertinent to note that the conversion application dated



06.02.2014 filed by the Applicant/Petitioner for conversion of the subject property from leasehold to freehold was rejected vide the impugned office order dated 16.08.2019. Thereafter, a Show Cause Notice dated 19.08.2019 was issued to the Applicant/Petitioner for failure to deposit outstanding dues, despite the same having been conveyed to the Applicant/Petitioner on multiple occasions, and for blatant violation of Clause 11(8) of the Lease Deed. The said proceedings were duly closed on account of default and non-payment of requisite fees.

5. That after rejection of the conversion application dated 06.02.2014, the Applicant/Petitioner never filed any fresh application, and therefore, no conversion application is presently pending before the Respondents.

6. That it is further submitted that the Applicant/Petitioner failed to comply with Clause 4 of the Conversion Scheme, which categorically stipulates that no application for conversion shall be entertained unless it is accompanied by the prescribed documents. Despite being afforded multiple opportunities, the Applicant/Petitioner failed to submit the requisite documents, and consequently, the application was rightly rejected.”

2. The petitioner is, therefore, permitted to file a fresh application along with the necessary fees. The same, however, shall remain without prejudice to the rights and contentions raised in the instant writ petition.

3. If the petitioner succeeds, the amount which is deposited, shall be directed to be refunded to the petitioner.

4. If such an application is received, let the respondent to consider the same and expeditious steps be taken to process it in accordance with law. The application shall not be rejected on the ground of earlier rejection or pendency of the writ petition as the petitioner is depositing the amount without prejudice to the rights and contentions.

5. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4322/2023 and CM APPL. 16639/2023

6. List on 04.08.2026.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 18, 2026/ aks/mj