

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

23.

+

W.P.(C) 4385/2016 & CM 18369/2016

KIDARSONS INDUSTRIES (P) LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Subhash C. Jindal, Advocate.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ORS Respondent

Through: Mr. Arjun Mitra and Mr. Abhishek

Mishra, Advocates for Respondents 1 and 3.

Mr. Santosh Kr. Tripathi, Advocate for R-2

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

13.05.2016

1. The Petitioner is aggrieved *inter alia* by a notice dated 10th March 2016 issued by the Respondent No.1, proposing to enhance the rateable value of the property in question.
2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that the Petitioner would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the Respondent for a time bound adjudication of the said notice.
3. It is seen that the Petitioner has replied to the said notice dated 10th March 2016 on 28th April 2016.

4. In that view of the matter, the authority concerned is directed to adjudicate the said notice dated 10th March 2016, after giving the Petitioner an effective opportunity of being heard, and pass a reasoned order not later than six weeks from today.

5. The petition and the application are accordingly disposed of. Order *dasti*.

S.MURALIDHAR, J

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

MAY 13, 2016
mg