



\$~72 to 76

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 393/2024**

DR VIJAY SINGH DAGARPetitioner

Through: Mr. V.P. Rana, Mr. Aviral Jain and
Ms. Bhawana, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr.
Nishant Gautam, CGSC, Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi, Mr. Vibhav
V. Nath and Ms. Theresa, Adv.
Mr. Anil Kaushik, ASG with Mr.
Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with Mr.
Sunil Kumar Jha and Mr. Mohd. Sueb
Akhtar, Advs. for LAC
Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Manika Tripathy, SC, DDA and Mr.
Ashutosh Kaushik, and Mr. Govind ,
Advs. for DDA
Ms. Saroj Bidawat, SPC for UOI
Mr. Kartik Batra, Adv.

~73

+ **W.P.(C) 3844/2010**

MASSON APARTMENTS PVT LTDPetitioner

Through: Mr Gaurav Sarin Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Charul Sarin and Mr.Harish Kumar
Advs.

versus

DDA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Anil Kaushik, ASG with Mr.
Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with Mr.
Sunil Kumar Jha and Mr. Mohd. Sueb
Akhtar, Advs. for LAC
Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv.



with Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC, DDA
and Mr. Ashutosh Kaushik, and Mr.
Govind , Advs. for DDA
Mr Rohan Lal Goel Mr Bhuvan Goel,
Advs.
Mr. Kartik Batra, Adv.

~74

+

W.P.(C) 7469/2011

SHRI RAM KALA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Ghawana & Mr.
Ashish Kumar, Advs.

versus

UOI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr.
Nishant Gautam, CGSC, Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi, Mr. Vibhav
V. Nath and Ms. Theresa, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Manika Tripathy, SC, DDA and Mr.
Ashutosh Kaushik, and Mr. Govind ,
Advs. for DDA
Mr. Kartik Batra, Adv.

~75

+

W.P.(C) 7929/2011

RAMPHAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. V.P. Rana, Mr. Aviral Jain and
Ms. Bhawana, Advs.

versus

UOI AND ORS

..Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr.
Nishant Gautam, CGSC, Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi, Mr. Vibhav
V. Nath and Ms. Theresa, Adv.
Mr. Anil Kaushik, ASG with Mr.
Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with Mr.
Sunil Kumar Jha and Mr. Mohd. Sueb



Akhtar, Advs. for LAC
Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Manika Tripathy, SC, DDA and Mr.
Ashutosh Kaushik, and Mr. Govind ,
Advs. for DDA
Ms. Saroj Bidawat, SPC for UOI

~76

+

W.P.(C) 6488/2013

SNEH APARTMENTS PVT. LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms Kiran Suri, Sr Adv. with Mr. Kunal
Kher and Ms. Aishwarya Kumar,
Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr.
Nishant Gautam, CGSC, Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi, Mr. Vibhav
V. Nath and Ms. Theresa, Adv.
Mr. Anil Kaushik, ASG with Mr.
Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with Mr.
Sunil Kumar Jha and Mr. Mohd. Sueb
Akhtar, Advs. for LAC
Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv. with Ms.
Manika Tripathy, SC, DDA and Mr.
Ashutosh Kaushik, and Mr. Govind ,
Advs. for DDA
Mr. Sukhbeer Kaur Bajwa, Mr. G.S.
Oberoi, Advs. for DDA
Mr. Kartik Batra, Adv.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

%

23.03.2026

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.



CM APPL. 14217/2024 (for exemption) in CONT.CAS(C) 393/2024

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 393/2024

W.P.(C) 3844/2010 & CM APPL. 7730/2010

W.P.(C) 7469/2011 & CM APPL. 37654/2021

W.P.(C) 7929/2011

W.P.(C) 6488/2013 & CM APPL. 14120/2013, CM APPL. 17974/2026

3. In terms of the previous order dated 9th March, 2026, this Court had noted that there appeared to be a relationship between M/s Masson Apartments Pvt. Ltd. and Sneh Apartments Pvt. Ltd. owing to the following factors:

- i. Both parties have the same address in the sale deeds furnished before the Court (100 - A, Empire Plaza, Empire Estate, Mehrauli, Gurgaon Road, Sultanpur, New Delhi);
- ii. Same person, i.e. Mr. Ramesh Chandra Goyal acting on behalf of both the companies in both sale deeds relied upon by the companies for claiming title to the land;
- iii. Mr. O.P. Chaudhary executed the sale deeds in favour of both the companies;
- iv. Mr. Pramod Kumar Biyani was the shareholder/director in both the companies.

4. Under these circumstances, on the last date of hearing, the Court had directed Mr. Mahinder Kumar Jajoo, the Director of M/s Sneh Apartments Pvt. Ltd. to appear before the Court, as also Mr. O.P. Choudhary, who is the General Attorney holder for M/s South Delhi Erectors Pvt. Ltd.

5. Mr. Jajoo is appearing before the Court today and is duly represented



by Mr. Kunal Kher and Mr. Kapil Kher, Id. Counsels.

6. Ms. Suri, Id. Senior Counsel has been engaged on behalf of M/s Sneh Apartments Pvt. Ltd. to make submissions before the Court.

7. On behalf of Mr. O.P. Choudhary, Mr. Aakash Elango, Id. Counsel submits that he has not received full instructions and was asked to appear today on behalf of Mr. Choudhary. It is further submitted by him that Mr. Choudhary was merely a GPA holder on behalf of one Mr. Ramesh Chandra Goyal for M/s South Delhi Erectors Pvt. Ltd.

8. ***W.P.(C) 3844/2010*** titled, ***Masson Apartments Pvt. Ltd. V. DDA and ors.*** and ***W.P.(C) 2116/2015*** titled ***M/S Massom Apartments Private Limited v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors.*** are also listed before the Court today.

9. Mr. Gaurav Sarin, Id. Senior Counsel appearing for M/s Masson Apartments Pvt. Ltd. has firstly clarified that the order dated 1st June, 2010 passed in ***W.P.(C) 3844/2010***, wherein *status quo* was granted in respect of Khasra No. 338, would be applicable only *qua* one bigha three biswas belonging to M/s Masson Apartment Pvt. Ltd. and the same does not apply to any other part of the Khasra No. 338.

10. Mr. Sarin, Id. Senior Counsel further submits that Mr. Pramod Kumar Biyani had transferred the shareholding in M/s Masson Apartments Pvt. Ltd. to Mr. V.K. Gulati, who has his address at A-64, Defence Colony, New Delhi, but is usually a resident of Australia.

11. He further submits that the writ petition filed by M/s Masson Apartments Pvt. Ltd., is in respect of limited aspects, which are as follows:

- i) Removal of fencing around the land of the Petitioner;
- ii) Restoration of property to its original condition;
- iii) Prayer for issuing a restraining order against interfering in the



possession of the Petitioner.

12. Initially, in the said writ petition, being **W.P.(C) 3844/2010**, vide order 1st June, 2010, *status quo* order was granted. Thereafter, vide order dated 4th July, 2013, the Court had directed the Respondent No. 2/Land Acquisition Collector to ensure that 80% of the compensation amount be offered to the Petitioner.

13. Thereafter, on 30th August, 2013, it was further directed by the Court in **W.P.(C) 3844/2010** as under :

“This Court directs that the amount deposited by the LAC shall be released to the owners of the land in question without prejudice to their rights and contentions.”

14. The physical possession of the land is stated to be with the Authorities, however, with respect to legal possession, it is not clear as to whether it is with the Respondents or not. On the said ground, the said amount appears to not have been released till date.

15. Ms. Suri, Id. Senior counsel has concluded her submissions today.

16. The appearances of all individuals are discharged for the time being.

17. **W.P.(C) 3844/2010** shall be reverted to the concerned Court, however, the electronic record of the said petition shall be retained with the writ petition for the purposes of reference only.

18. List all these matters for further hearing on 6th April, 2026.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

MADHU JAIN, J.

MARCH 23, 2026/ys/ss