



\$~2 (Appellate Side)

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

+ W.P.(C) 3876/2025, CM APPL. 1685/2026, CM APPL. 1686/2026 & CM APPL. 9815/2026

MEGHNA BHUYAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rudra Pratap, Mr. Tushar Randhawa, Mr. Rahul Sharma, Mr. Ali Ibrahim, Advs. with petitioner in person.

Mob: 8800000881

Email: rudra@r.pandchamber.com

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tarunvir Singh Khehar and Mr. Guneet Bindra, Advs. for MCD

Mob: 9910122225

Email: contactuskla@gmail.com

Mr. Nimish Chib, Adv. and Mr. Ajay Mishra, Adv. for R-4 to 8.

Mob: 9810823566

Email:

nimishchibandassociates@gmail.com

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

12.02.2026

CM APPL. 1686/2026 (For Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. Application is disposed of.

CM APPL. 1685/2026 (For recalling of the order dated 17th November, 2025)



3. The present application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking recall of the order dated 17th November, 2025 passed by this Court.
4. It is the contention of the petitioner that at the time of hearing of the matter on 17th November, 2025, the petitioner was not represented by any counsel, as the new counsel engaged by the petitioner, i.e., Mr. Rudra Pratap, who was not present on the said date.
5. The petitioner, i.e., Ms. Meghna Bhuyan, is present in person before this Court and confirms the fact that she had engaged Mr. Rudra Pratap, Advocate, as reflected in the order dated 27th October, 2025.
6. Ms. Meghna Bhuyan submits that since she had engaged Mr. Rudra Pratap as a new counsel, therefore, Mr. M. A. Chaudhary and Mr. Shehzad Khan, Advocates assisted by Mr. Vivek Dixit, Mr. Salimuddin and Mr. Kanish Singh, Advocates, were not entitled to appear on behalf of the petitioner on 17th November, 2025, as recorded in the said order.
7. It is submitted that the said counsels wrongly put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner on the said date.
8. However, Mr. M. A. Chaudhary and Mr. Shehzad Khan, Advocates are present in Court before this Court and submit that they had validly appeared on behalf of the petitioner on 17th November, 2025.
9. Considering the submissions made before this Court, the matter is referred to the Bar Council of Delhi ("BCD"), to resolve the issues in this regard, and pass appropriate orders after following the due process.
10. The details of Mr. M. A. Chaudhary and Mr. Shehzad Khan, Advocates, are given as under:

*"Mr. M. A. Chaudhary, Advocate
Enrollment No. D/654/2021*



Mob: 9810506786

Email: oluscalegal7@gmail.com

Mr. Shehzad Khan, Advocate

Enrollment No. D/567/92

Mob: 9716379252

Email: advocate.khanshehzad@gmail.com”

11. The details of Mr. Rudra Pratap, Advocate, are given as under:

“Mr. Rudra Pratap, Advocate

Enrollment No. D/4102/2013

Mob: 8800000881

Email: rudra@r.pandchamber.com”

12. Ms. Meghna Bhuyan is present in Court, and her Aadhaar Card, as given to this Court, is reproduced as under:





13. The details of Ms. Meghna Bhuyan, the petitioner in the present case, are further noted as under:

“Name: Meghna Bhuyan
Aadhaar No. 5308 4353 2383
Mob: 8851141912, 9953714157
Email: meghanhanup@gmail.com”

14. The petitioner, Ms. Meghna Bhuyan, is at liberty to make a representation to the BCD, which shall issue notices to the respective parties and pass appropriate orders, after following the due process.

15. This Court notes that *vide* order dated 17th November, 2025, this Court had disposed of the present writ petition on the ground that the earlier No Objection Certificate (“NOC”) granted by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“MCD”) for installation of the lift had been withdrawn by the MCD *vide* its order dated 22nd October, 2025.

16. Subsequently, the MCD has given a new permission on 22nd December, 2025.

17. Since, the present writ petition had been filed within respect to the earlier permission granted by MCD *vide* letter dated 10th February, 2025, in view of the fact that the said permission already stood withdrawn *vide* order dated 22nd October, 2025, the present writ petition had become infructuous.

18. Accordingly, considering the submissions made before this Court, the petitioner, i.e., Ms. Meghna Bhuyan is granted liberty to file a fresh writ petition challenging the new/fresh permission dated 22nd December, 2025 issued by the MCD for installation of the lift in question.

19. Needless to state, this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case, which shall be adjudicated at the relevant time, in the appropriate proceedings.



20. With the aforesaid directions, the present application is disposed of.

CM APPL. 9815/2026

21. The present application has been filed on behalf of respondent no. 4 seeking directions that the respondent no. 4 may not be restrained from installation of the lift, in terms of the NOC dated 22nd December, 2025, issued by the respondent no. 1, i.e., MCD.

22. Needless to state, the respondent no. 4 is at liberty to carry out the work of installation of the lift, in terms of NOC dated 22nd December, 2025, issued by the MCD, subject to any order that may be passed in any writ that may be filed by the petitioner, i.e., Ms. Meghna Bhuyan, or to any subsequent order that may be passed by the MCD pursuant to the representation made by the petitioner in that regard.

23. With the aforesaid directions, the present application is disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

FEBRUARY 12, 2026

ak