



\$~62

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

+ W.P.(C) 13351/2022 and CM APPL. 40512/2022

NAVKETAN ENGINEERING CORPORATION THROUGH ITS
PARTNER SH ANIL GULATIPetitioner

Through: Mr Abhijat, Sr. Advocate with Ms
Svetlana Correya, Advocate.

versus

DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND
INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION LIMITED & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Ruchika Rathi, Advocate (present
in Court) with Ms. Nazuk Kumar.
MD, DSIIDC and Ms. Zainab Zehra
Kazmi Legal Assistant For DSIIDC
(Thr. VC)
Ms. Kritika gupta and Ms. Vidushi
Singhania, Advocates for R-2.
Mr. Sumit K. Batra and Ms. Priyanka
Jindal, Advocates for R/ GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

01.04.2026

1. *Vide* order dated 16.05.2025, the petitioner confined its prayer to the extent of directing respondent no. 1 i.e., Delhi State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd. ['**DSIIDC**'] to adopt the policy framed by the respondent no. 2 i.e., the Delhi Development Authority



[‘DDA’] for restoration of cancelled lease deeds.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is, primarily, with respect to the restoration of its lease of the property in question by the DSIIDC. During proceedings, on 27.05.2025, the stand taken by DSIIDC was that it would adopt the policy relating to restoration of leases of the DDA and consider the application of the petitioner in accordance with the same.

3. DSIIDC had, specifically, submitted that it had decided to adopt the Restoration Policy “*in principle*”. It was also submitted that only certain formalities/approvals were remaining, the process of which is likely to take two months’ time. This Court, *vide* order of even date, had directed DSIIDC to complete the exercise, within the aforesaid period of time. However, till date, the said Policy has not received the required approval. The relevant portion of the said order is extracted below, for reference:

“1. Learned counsel for the DSIIDC (respondent no. 1) accedes that a restoration policy has been framed by the DDA (respondent no. 2) for restoration of cancelled lease deeds, which the DSIIDC has decided to adopt in principle. She further submits that for a formal adoption of the said policy, certain formalities / approvals are required, including approval from the Lt. Governor, the process of which is likely to take two months time.

2. Let the DSIIDC expedite the process of taking the requisite approval, which must be completed within the period indicated by their learned counsel.”

4. Earlier also, the Court had noted that the conduct of the DSIIDC has been *prima facie* non-compliant. Despite repeated opportunities, appropriate action has not been taken by them. Order dated 25.08.2025 is extracted below, for reference:

“1. Learned counsel for DSIIDC seeks some further time to comply with the directions contained in the order dated 27.05.2025. Let the same be done



*within a period of two weeks from today.
2. List on 29.10.2025.”*

5. Further, *vide* order dated 08.01.2026, this Court directed DSIIDC to place on record a formal order of adoption of the requisite Restoration Policy before the next date of hearing. Paragraph no. 9 of the said order reads as under:

“9. It is made clear that, if the formal order of adoption is not placed on record, let the Managing Director (MD) of DSIIDC to remain personally present on the next date of hearing to explain the circumstances.”

6. DSIIDC appears to have treated multiple extensions and directions with casual indifference. The formal order of adoption mandated by this Court remains non-existent till date.

7. On 30.03.2026, this Court sought details of the date on which the requisite file was sent to the office of the Lieutenant Governor and noted the position taken by the Department of Industries that DSIIDC was unresponsive to the repeated communications issued by the former. It also considered that any such policy would have to be routed through the Department of Industry itself. Therefore, there are significant discrepancies in the stand taken by DSIIDC. This internal departmental friction suggests that the information provided to this Court by DSIIDC has been, at best, inconsistent and, at worst, misleading.

8. In deference to the order passed by the Court on 30.03.2026, Ms. Nazuk Kumar, Managing Director [**MD**] of DSIIDC, appears through Video Conferencing [**VC**]. She submits that the draft proposal for the ‘Guidelines and Standard Operating Procedure [**SoP**]’ of DSIIDC on Restoration of Determined Lease Deeds’ [**Restoration Policy**] has been sent to the Department of Industries for approval by the Lieutenant



Governor ['LG']. However, paragraph no. 14 of the additional affidavit filed by DSIIDC dated 27.03.2026 takes the following position:

“14. That it is submitted that as on date, the Restoration Policy stands finalized and has already been submitted for approval of the competent authority, and the matter is presently under consideration before the Hon’ble Lieutenant Governor.”

9. A perusal of the above extract of the affidavit would clearly indicate that the matter is still under consideration before the LG and that the draft proposal has not yet been approved by the LG Office. There is, therefore, *ex facie* a sharp contrast in the oral stand taken by the MD, DSIIDC in its aforementioned affidavit, and the submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the said authority.

10. The aforesaid position, *prima facie*, indicates lack of diligence on the part of DSIIDC in carrying out directions issued by the Court. The lack of clarity on the actual status of the Restoration Policy has led to a situation of ‘hang fire’ for more than ten months, despite express directions by this Court on various dates. The MD of DSIIDC should be held responsible for not diligently pursuing these proceedings and for providing incorrect information to the Court. The same would impede in the dispensation of justice and therefore, would be within the contempt jurisdiction of this Court.

11. Let notice be issued to Ms. Nazuk Kumar, MD of DSIIDC. Let her to file a personal affidavit before the next date of hearing to satisfy the Court as to why the contempt action should not be taken against those responsible.

12. List on 09.04.2026.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 1, 2026/aks