

\$~42

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 2190/2016 & CM Nos.9394/2016 & 9395/2016
EIH LIMITED Petitioner
Through : Mr. Rakesh K. Khanna, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Lalit Gupta, Adv.
versus

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION Respondent
Through : Mr. Ajjay Aroraa, Mr. Kapil Dutta
and Mr. Dinesh Puchnanda, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

% **14.03.2016**

Petitioner has prayed in this writ petition that respondent be directed to revalidate the building plan in terms of the application submitted by the petitioner. It may be pointed out that petitioner had filed the application for revalidation of the building plan, which is pending before the respondent. Vide letter dated 29th February, 2015 (though it should be 2016), respondent has informed the petitioner that building plan, filed by it, is not a valid building plan because it does not contain requisite details, plans and documents prescribed under the building bye-laws/provisions of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957. Petitioner has been directed to submit the complete file of the case including four sets of proposed plans and other

required documents duly signed by the registered Architect and Structural Engineer as per provision of BBL/DMC Act-1957. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that requisite documents have already been submitted. Respondent is directed to inform the petitioner within two weeks about the details of the documents, which are required from the petitioner to be submitted for processing the pending application of the petitioner. Thereafter, petitioner shall furnish the documents within two weeks. Respondent shall, thereafter, decide the application of the petitioner within four weeks by a speaking order, after affording the opportunity of personal hearing to petitioner. Order so passed be communicated to the petitioner.

Writ petition is disposed of in the above terms. Miscellaneous applications are disposed of as infructuous.

Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

MARCH 14, 2016/dk