

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 8230/2016 & CM APPLs. 34107-34108/2016

RANJIT SINGH

Through

..... Petitioner

Mr. Himanshu Pathak, Advocate

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR.

Through

..... Respondents

Ms. Kanika Singh, Asst. Standing
Counsel with Mr. Rishi Vohra, Advocate
and Mr. Vicky Kumar, D.E.O. for
R-1/NDMC.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN****ORDER**

%

26.09.2016

After some arguments, learned counsel for petitioner prays that the present writ petition be treated as a representation to respondent no. 2.

Consequently, present writ petition and applications are disposed of with a direction to respondent no. 2 to treat the present writ petition as a representation and decide the same within four weeks by way of a reasoned order. In the event, the petitioner is aggrieved by the decision taken by respondent no. 2, petitioner shall be at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

This Court clarifies that it has not adjudicated upon the maintainability of the writ petition in the present proceedings.

Order dasti.

MANMOHAN, J**SEPTEMBER 26, 2016**

m