



\$~13

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LPA 608/2025, CM APPL. 61718/2025 & CM APPL. 61719/2025

ADARSH RAMLILA COMMITTEE

.....Appellant

Through: Mr.Rajiv Saxena, Sr.Adv with Mr.Sunil
Satyarthi, Ms.Anchisha Satyarthi,
Mr.Amitanshu Satyarthi and
Mr.Kaibalyan Kumar Ojha, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms.Manika Tripathy, SC for DDA with
Mr.Gautam Yadav and Mr.Aakash
Mohar, Advs.

Date of Decision: 26th September, 2025

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

JUDGEMENT

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J : (ORAL)

1. Present Letters Patent Appeal has been filed challenging the order dated 18.09.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 13235/2025 titled "*Yamuna Kamal Club vs. Delhi Development Authority & Anr.*", wherein the learned Single Judge has allowed writ petition by directing the respondent no.1/DDA to accept the Booking Application of the respondent no.2 for holding Ramleela Celebrations/Functions for the year 2025 at the subject site/plot with a total area measuring 6585 sq. mts., both part of GTB Ground, Opposite GTB Hospital, Delhi – 110093 and further directed the respondent no.1/DDA to return the amount received by them for booking of the said plots from the appellant for the year 2025.



2. Mr. Saxena, learned senior counsel fairly admitted that the subject plot of land for the purpose of Ramleela had been allotted to respondent no.2 for the years 2023 and 2024. Despite having been allotted, respondent no.2 did not organise any Ramleela function in the year 2023. He contends that mere booking or allotment would not be enough and as per clause (2) of the SOP, the intending allottee is required to show evidence of the Ramleela function having been organised in 2 years out of the last 3 years. His contention is that since even as per the DCP order dated 01.09.2025, *“No stage Ramlila was conducted during the year 2023 at the said ground”*, the respondent no.2 cannot be stated to have held the Ramleela function at the subject site/plot.

3. On the basis of the aforesaid contention, learned senior counsel states that cancellation of booking of the appellant by the respondent no.1/DDA is unilateral and granting allotment of the same plot of land to the respondent no.2 in the aforesaid circumstances is contrary to the SOP. Thus, the impugned order needs to be set aside and the subject plot ought to be allotted to the appellant.

4. We have heard Mr. Saxena, learned senior counsel and Ms. Manika Tripathy, standing counsel for respondent no.1/DDA and perused the records of the case.

5. Having regard to the fact that the learned senior counsel for the appellant admits that the respondent no.2 was in fact allotted the subject plot of land for the years 2023 and 2024, the SOP in question appears to be clearly applicable to the case of respondent no.2. In so far as the contention that there is no proof of the respondent no.2 having or not having held Ramleela function on the subject plot in the year 2023 is concerned, we note that the learned Single Judge referred to a letter dated 04.09.2025 issued by the DCP clarifying that respondent no.2 had indeed organised Ramleela function only at the end of



Dussehra festival i.e., 24.10.2023. This clearly points out to the fact that respondent no.2 had infact not only been allotted the subject plot of land in the year 2023 but also organised the Ramleela function.

6. That apart, learned Single Judge has referred to two orders passed by this Court namely, (i) – order dated 18.10.2023 in W.P(C)12316/2023, whereby the cancellation of allotment of the same plot of land by the respondent no.1/DDA in the year 2023 was set aside with a permission to respondent no.2 to go ahead with its booking for Ramleela function at the subject plot and (ii) – order dated 23.09.2024 in W.P.(C) 11669/2024, the challenge to the respondent no.1/DDA booking the subject plot in favour of respondent no.2 was challenged and failed confirming the booking in favour of respondent no.2. It is also to be noted that the appellant has not challenged clause (2) of the SOP. Having regard to the two orders referred to above coupled with the facts noted above it is beyond doubt that the respondent no.2 not only allotted the subject plot in the years 2023 and 2024 and also had organized Ramleela function in those 2 years. In such circumstances it cannot be assumed that respondent no.2 did not organise Ramleela function for the 2 years out of the last 3 years.

7. Resultantly, there is no merit in the present appeal. The same stands dismissed.

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/rl