

\$~53

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6077/2016**
RAMESH KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Dharmender Sharma, Advocate.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Sri Harsha Peechara and Mr.
Mananjay Kumar Mishra, Advocate
for NDMC/R-1.
Mr.Sanjay S.Malik, Advocate for
Delhi Police.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **18.07.2016**

C.M. Nos.24931-32/2016

Exemption is allowed subject to just exceptions. Applications disposed of.

W.P.(C) 6077/2016 & C.M. No.24933/2016

The petitioner is apprehensive of the fact that the respondent/New Delhi Municipal Council would take action against his squatting site.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondent has appeared on advance notice. His submission is that the petitioner admittedly has a squatting site but the area which is permitted to him under his original allotment has been exceeded by him pursuant to which the respondent no.1 has taken appropriate action by demolishing that portion of his

extension which was over and above his allotted site.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection on this count. His only apprehension is reiterated which is to the effect that his original allotted site should not be touched unless the Town Vending Committee (TVC) comes into picture.

Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the TVC has been constituted qua the respondent no.1. The New Delhi Municipal Council and TVC will take action in terms of the directions given by the Division bench in the judgment of Bhola Ram and Anr.Vs. Patel NDMC.

No further orders are called for in this petition.

Petition disposed of in the above terms.

Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JULY 18, 2016

ndn