

\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 7200/2016 & C.M. No.29595-96/2016**
VIPIN DUA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr S.C. Singhal, Adv.

versus

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Manoj Kumar Sharma, Adv for
R-1 with Mr. J.D. Atkaan, A.E.
Mr. Siddharth Shankar, Adv for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **16.08.2016**

The petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that the free flow of traffic by raising a boundary wall on the mail old Rohtak Road (approaching towards the Azad Market, Delhi) has obstructed his access. His further submission is that even presuming that this boundary wall has to be raised (in view of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 1 on advance notice who submits that there is ongoing project 'road under bridge' for which reason this boundary wall has been created) the service lane should be cleared; to substantiate this submission that the service lane stands obstructed, he has placed on record certain photographs showing that there is a line of parked cars which blocks his access from his storage godown.

The Delhi Police has also been arrayed as a party. He is

respondent No. 2. Respondent No. 2 is also present. He is represented through his counsel. Respondent No. 2 is directed to ensure that there is no illegal and unauthorized cars parked on this service lane. The SHO, Gulabi Bagh will ensure that this order will be complied with in true letter and spirit.

No further orders are called for on this petition. It is disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

AUGUST 16, 2016

A

\$
*
+

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
W.P.(C) 7201/2016 & C.M. No.29598/2016
SUBHASH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Sunil Dahiya, Adv.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

16.08.2016

The petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that his application seeking allotment of an alternate plot has not been answered.

On advance notice, learned counsel for the respondent has put in appearance. Her submission is that the petitioner has himself placed on record the document at page 50 which shows that the case of the petitioner was considered. The document shows that the case of the petitioner was placed before the Committee. He was requested to submit requisite documents and to appear before the Recommendation Committee for personal hearing on 23.12.2015. The petitioner had appeared before the Committee. On the scrutiny of the documents on record, it was observed that as per application the share of the applicant is 1/3 but in khatoni and payment certificate, it is mentioned as 1/9. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant thereto on 02.03.2016, he has moved an application before

the Chairman of the Land and Building Department informing him of the clarification of his share; submission is that he has a 1/9th share and not 1/3rd in the aforementioned land. His grievance is that this clarificatory letter dated 02.03.2016 has not been answered by the Department. Learned counsel for the respondent on this score submits that this letter shall be answered in accordance with law and in case it has already not been answered, the same shall be answered within a period of four weeks from today.

No further orders are called for on this petition. It is disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

AUGUST 16, 2016

A