

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

W.P. (C) No.13243/2009

Date of Decision: October 20, 2010

SUNITA DEWAN ..... Petitioner  
through Mr. Sumit Bansal, Advocate with  
Mr. Ateev Mathur, Advocate

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ORS .... Respondents  
through Mr. Rakesh Mittal, Advocate for  
respondent No.1.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MISS JUSTICE REKHA SHARMA**

1. Whether the reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? No
2. To be referred to the reporter or not? No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the 'Digest'? No

**REKHA SHARMA, J. (ORAL)**

It is submitted by learned counsel for respondent No.1-DDA that a new policy on misuser charges as contained in Circular dated March 26, 2010 has come into existence and that the case of the petitioner along with similarly situated persons will be considered afresh by respondent No.1 in terms of the new policy.

In view of the above, respondent No.1-DDA is directed to treat the present writ-petition as a representation from the petitioner and consider her case in terms of the aforesaid policy within six weeks from now after giving her personal hearing. In case the order passed is

unfavourable to the petitioner, the same shall not be given effect to for a period of three weeks in order to enable her to seek her remedy against any such order.

With this direction, the writ-petition is disposed of.

**REKHA SHARMA, J.**

**OCTOBER 20, 2010**

**ka**