



\$~100

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9324/2025**

SANJAY ARORA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.K. Rungta, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Prashant Singh and Mr. Sumit Pargal,
Advocates.

Versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Sanjay Katyal, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Ritika Bansal, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

09.07.2025

CM APPL. 39378/2025

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 9324/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing the impugned communication dated 26.03.2025 whereby claim of the petitioner for allotment of MIG flat under the Re-development Scheme of Ashoka Pahari has been rejected.

4. Mr. S.K. Rungta, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that the rejection has been premised on the ground that the brother of the petitioner namely Anil Arora has already been allotted a Shop i.e. shop no. 31, Ashoka Pahari under the Scheme, therefore, petitioner is not entitled for another allotment inasmuch as a person in the family has already got one allotment.



5. He invites attention of the Court to the survey of Ashoka Pahari which was conducted in July, 2001 to contend that the name of Anil Arora has been separately shown in the survey and the property which he was occupying at the relevant time has also been mentioned as T-2367A, the use of which has been depicted as commercial.

6. He also refers to entry 217 in the said survey to contend that the name of mother of the petitioner namely, Raj Rani has been separately indicated in the survey and the property which she was occupying bears a separate number i.e.T-844 and the use of the said property has been shown as residential.

7. He further contends that the survey also indicates that Raj Rani was in possession of ground floor as well as first floor of the property bearing no. T-844, therefore, the premise on which the rejection has been predicated is not factually correct.

8. In view of above, issue notice. Mr. Sanjay Katyal, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/DDA accepts notice.

9. Let counter-affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed within a period of two weeks thereafter.

CM APPL. 39377/2025

10. Issue notice. Mr. Sanjay Katyal, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/DDA accepts notice.

11. Let reply to the application be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed within a period of two weeks thereafter.

12. List on 09.09.2025.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JULY 9, 2025/jg