

1  
EX CIVIL 17/12/2014 15979/16

C. K. JAIN  
Vs.  
UNION OF INDIA

Present: Mr. Mayank Bansal, Ld. Counsel for LR's of DH  
Ms. Sarita Aggarwal, Ld. Counsel for UOI

O R D E R  
04.04.2025

1. Remaining payable amount not received from the UOI despite specific order.
2. Let bank account of the LAC concerned be attached to the extent of the remaining payable amount on filing of PF.
3. An application for review of order dated 21.02.2025 is filed on behalf of the LR's of DH.
4. Heard.
5. The first ground taken in application is that the advocates were on strike on 21.02.2025 and therefore, this Court should not have passed any adverse order.
6. The argument is wholly misconceived as the order dated 21.02.2025 was not an adverse order passed on account of non appearance of counsel but the same was a speaking order deciding the objection filed by the DH on 20.09.2024.
7. Furthermore, Ld. Counsel for DH had addressed arguments on the same on 18.10.2024, as was also recorded in the order sheet dated 13.12.2024. Ld counsel for DH had also filed citations in his support i.e. *CIT Faridabad v. Ghanshyam* and *Jagmal Singh v. State of Haryana* which had been duly considered in the order dated 21.02.2025.

8. The next ground of review is that this Court has wrongly interpreted the words of the judgment “enhancement over and above the amount of compensation awarded by Land Acquisition Collector”.

9. In this regard, paragraphs 4 to 9 of the order dated 21.02.2025 may be referred to. There is no error apparent on the record and if the DH is aggrieved by the interpretation given by this Court, he may exercise his remedies in law.

10. The next ground of review is that the reliance on letter dated 21.11.2017 in the impugned order was misconceived as the case of the DH was squarely covered by the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court.

11. Ld. counsel is apprised that this aspect was also dealt with in detail in the impugned order and that the judgment relied upon by him did not pertain to acquisition of land in Delhi. I have inquired from learned counsel if he has any other judgment pertaining to land acquisition in Delhi which holds that TDS is not applicable on compensation. To this, learned counsel has replied in negative.

12. Accordingly, there is no merit in the review application and the same is dismissed.

13. Cheque in the sum of Rs.7,92,232/- dated 03.04.2025 in the name of LAC/New Delhi qua TDS amount received after revalidation from SBI, Dwarka Court Complex Branch. Be handed over to concerned Kanugo against proper receipt.

14. Put up for report on attachment on **29.04.2025**.

(Richa Gusain Solanki)  
District Judge-02, South-West,  
Dwarka Courts, Delhi  
04.04.2025/*dk*