



\$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **LA.APP. 144/2015**

UNION OF INDIA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr. Divakar
Kapil, Advs. for Mr. Sanjay Kumar
Pathak, St. Counsel
Ms. Anju Sehgl, Sr. AO, Central

versus

VINOD KUMAR GUJRAL AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. P. P. Ahuja, Adv.

CORAM:

REGISTRAR GENERAL SH. ARUN BHARDWAJ

ORDER

%

24.11.2025

CM No. 6953/2025

1. Vide order dated 06.04.2015, appellant was directed to deposit awarded amount in this court.
2. Vide order dated 28.09.2015, it was informed that compensation has been deposited in the Court, which was directed to be kept in an interest bearing FD initially for a period of six months, renewable for a similar period for expiry. The respondent was given the liberty to withdraw the amount to the tune of ₹29,070/- per sq. mtr. without security and the remaining amount was to be placed in a FD, as aforesaid. Respondent was given liberty to withdraw the said amount against security.
3. Vide order dated 03.12.2015, it was clarified that the respondent be released compensation on the base rate of ₹29,070/- per sq. mtr. with all other statutory benefits as are available in law i.e. the respondents shall be entitled



to interest and solatium in terms of the LA Act computed @ of ₹29,070/- per sq. mtr.

4. Vide order dated 03.05.2016, it was noted that total amount payable to respondent No.1 is ₹1,37,50,508/- @ of ₹60,698/- per sq. mtr. after subtracting the amount which respondent no.1 had already received @ of ₹12,127/- per sq. mtr. as per the award of the LAC. The appellant had filed calculation as per which ₹47,94,195/- had to be released to respondent No.1 without security, which was directed to be released in favour of respondent No.1.

5. On 30.05.2016, respondent No.1 furnished security bond for release of balance amount of ₹91,86,194/-. The bond was accepted and this balance sum was released in favour of respondent no.1 and endorsement was made on the sale deed which was furnished as security.

6. Vide CM No.53995/2018, respondent No.1 requested change of security which was allowed by the Hon'ble Court by order dated 11.03.2019 and as a result the earlier sale deed was returned to the respondent No.1 and endorsement was made on the gift deed dated 17.09.2012.

7. On 12.07.2024, respondent No.1 filed CM application bearing No.38910/2024 and made the following prayer in that application;

“i) to pass an order for discharge of surety given by the respondent no.1 alongwith his surety/wife Smt Nishi Gujral in respect of second floor portion of property bearing no. 10212-10216 out of Kliasra No.1450/1255. area measuring 235.47 sq mtrs. in Block-S, situated at Western Extension Area, Karol Bagh, Ajmal Khan Road, Delhi may be discharged as nobody has claimed any amount in respect of the portions of property bearing No.1 B/7 Pusa Road, New Delhi and acquired by MRTS.

ii) Necessary direction may be passed by this Hon'ble court thereby directing the Registrar General of this High Court to



remove the noting on the original gift deed dated 14.9.2012 regarding the surety given by Smt Nishi Gujral and respondent no.1 may be discharged...."

8. Vide order dated 12.09.2024, the Hon'ble Court directed the learned counsel for respondent No.1 to take instructions from respondent No.1 regarding furnishing of fresh surety to the extent of 50% of the decretal amount and the indemnity bond in respect of the remaining 50% of the decretal amount.

9. Respondent No.1 filed CM application No.6953/2025 with the following prayers;

"(a) appropriate orders thereby directing the surety furnished by the respondent no. 1 may be accepted for a sum of Rs.46,13,860/- (Rupees Forty Six Lacs Thirteen Thousand Eight Hundred Sixty) 50% of Rs. 92,27,721/- (Rupees Ninety Two Lacs Twenty Seven Thousand Seven Hundred Twenty One) in favour of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

(b) And also to accept the bond of Rs.46,13,860/- (Rupees Forty Six Lacs Thirteen Thousand Eight Hundred Sixty) 50% of Rs. 92,27,721/- (Rupees Ninety Two Lacs Twenty Seven Thousand Seven Hundred Twenty One) furnished by Vinod Kumar Gujral respondent no.1 may be accepted as ordered by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide order dated 12.09.2024.

(c) That the necessary order may be passed by the Hon'ble Court regarding discharging of surety given by Nishi Gujral for a sum of Rs. 91,86,194/- (Rupees Ninety One Lacs Eighty Six Thousand One Hundred Ninety Four) in respect of second floor portion of the property 10212-10216 out of Khasra No. 1450/1255, area measuring 235.47 Sq. Mtrs. in Block-S, situated at Western Extension Area, Karol Bagh, Ajmal Khan Road, Delhi.

(d) Necessary noting made by the Registrar General of Delhi High Court of the Gift Deed dated 14.09.2012 may order to be removed in respect of the second floor portion of the aforesaid property....."

10. Vide order dated 03.09.2025, the court of Id. JR (Judicial) took on record FDR of ₹50,00,000/- and Indemnity Bond of respondent No.1 and placed the matter before this court for passing further directions.



11. On 15.09.2025, it was noted that the FDR of ₹50,00,000/- will be inadequate in as much as earlier a sum of ₹91,86,194/- was released against the security furnished by respondent No.1 and ld. Counsel for respondent No.1 took time to furnish supplementary security and proper security bond.

12. On 17.10.2025, ld. counsel for respondent No.1 proposed to furnish an FDR of ₹25,00,000/- in addition to the FDR of ₹50,00,000/- already furnished by respondent No.1 for the release of gift deed given by way of security but learned counsel for appellant submitted that he be given an opportunity to inform the amount of security required to be furnished by respondent No.1 for release of the gift deed.

13. Thereafter matter was listed on 30.10.2025 and 14.11.2025 and thereafter today i.e. 24.11.2025, but the calculation has still not been filed by the appellant and request has been made for adjournment.

14. The adjournment request is opposed by Sh. P. P. Ahuja, learned counsel for the respondent no.1 who filed the Indemnity Bond alongwith affidavit and copy of FDR of Rs.25 lacs (computer generated print out which is directed to be kept in safe custody of concerned DR) has and submitted that considerable time has already been given to UOI and the application for release of the Gift Deed of the property, be passed today itself.

15. In the order dated 15.09.2025, this court has noted that the amount of ₹47,94,195/- was released in favour of the respondent no.1 without security and ₹91,86,194/- has been released against the security.

16. Respondent no.1 has already deposited FDR of ₹50 lacs and has filed another FDR of ₹25 lacs which makes total amount of the two FDRs ₹75 lacs.

17. Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, learned counsel for the UOI has also submitted that the FDRs being offered by the respondent no.1 are not sufficient for the



release of the Gift Deed submitted by him but is unable to say the amount of security required to be furnished by respondent No.1 for the release of the gift deed furnished earlier by respondent No.1 as security.

18. In the opinion of this court, the security amount required to be furnished by respondent No.1 should be for a sum of ₹91,86,194/- alongwith such rate of interest as the Hon'ble Court may deem appropriate from the date of release of that amount i.e. 30.05.2016 till date.

19. In this regard, learned counsel for the respondent no. 1 has referred to the order dated 12.09.2024 passed in CM 38910/2024 in which the Hon'ble Court had granted him the opportunity to take appropriate instructions from respondent no.1 regarding furnishing of fresh security to the extent of 50% of the decretal amount and furnishing of indemnity bond for the amount of remaining 50% of the decretal amount.

20. In case, respondent no. 1 has to pay security for 50% of the compensation, then the FDRs of Rs. 75 lacs (if interest w.e.f. 30.05.2016 is not taken into consideration) will be sufficient for 50% of the compensation awarded in his favour. However, on 12.09.2024, the Hon'ble Court had directed the learned counsel for the respondent no.1 to take instructions regarding furnishing of security to the extent of 50% of the decretal amount but specific orders in this regard were not passed. In the absence of specific orders, in the opinion of this court, respondent no.1 is required to furnish security of Rs.91,86,194/- with interest, whereas FDRs being offered by the respondent no. 1 are totalling Rs.75 lacs only.

21. In this situation, respondent no.1 is required to furnish further FDRs of the balance amount for release of the Gift Deed or seek orders from the Hon'ble Court to release him 50% of the decretal amount on indemnity bond



and 50% on the security bond.

22. The pending applications are disposed of with the directions to respondent No.1 to deposit further security for ₹16,86,194/- with such rate of interest on ₹91,86,194/- from 30.05.2016 till date as may be directed by the Hon'ble Court.

ARUN BHARDWAJ
REGISTRAR GENERAL

NOVEMBER 24, 2025/ss