

\$~16

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 352/2015
KAMLESH SHUKLA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through Mr. Ali Qambar Zaidi, Adv.
versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ajjay Aroaa, Mr. Kapil Dutta,
Ms. Surbhi Gupta and Ms. Diksha
Lal, Advs for the SDMC.
Mr. Rahul Bakshi and Mr. Nishant
Sharma, Advs for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **22.11.2016**

Review Pet. No.509/2016 & C.M. Nos. 43037/2016 &43049/2016

The petitioner is seeking review of the order dated 05.09.2016.

His submission is that the additional affidavit of the petitioner which he has filed on 15.03.2015 was not considered by the Court while disposing of this petition on 05.09.2016; the status reports of the Department alone have been considered.

A specific query has been put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to what he wishes to highlight out of the aforementioned additional affidavit. He has placed reliance on para 8 of the aforementioned affidavit. This paragraph has been perused. This paragraph notes that photographs show that in plots No. B-286 & B-250, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi construction has been permitted even after March, 2015. This Court notes that the status reports filed by the Department are dated October, 2015 and December, 2015. The

order of which review has been sought had noted the status reports of the Department and all the actions taken against the 88 properties which were the subject matter of this writ petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner, on another query put to him, states that for further information, he has to take instructions. This Court is not happy with the approach adopted by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He has approached this Court seeking a review of the order without any instruction.

Be that as it may, even the additional affidavit sought to be highlighted by the learned counsel for the petitioner has already been taken care off; this Court again notes that the status reports filed by the Department are much later in time to the averments made in the additional affidavit which were to the effect that construction in plots No. B-286 and B-250 had been permitted after March, 2015. These status reports filed by the Department in October, 2015 and December, 2015 have already stated that all actions against the alleged illegal activities which are the subject matter of the writ petition have been taken and the same had been noted specifically in para 2 of the order dated 05.09.2016.

This review petition is dismissed with costs quantified at Rs.10,000/-.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

NOVEMBER 22, 2016

A