

\$~16

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C)11737/2016**

ABHISHEK AGGARWAL & ANR. Petitioners

Through: Ms.Kirti Uppal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr.Sagar Pathak & Mr.Atul,
Advocates.

versus

**THE COMMISSIONER EAST DELHI
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION & ANR.** Respondents

Through: Mr.Rajan Tyagi, Advocate for EDMC

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **15.12.2016**

CM No.46223/2016

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C)11737/2016

1. This writ petition has been received on mentioning of urgent hearing as Hon'ble Ms.Justice Indermeet Kaur is on leave.
2. On behalf of East Delhi Municipal Corporation Mr.Rajan Tyagi, Advocate, who has appeared on advance notice being served, submits that the application filed by the writ petitioner was rejected as it was not accompanied by the requisite fee and development charges.
3. Learned counsel for the East Delhi Municipal Corporation (EDMC) has placed on record copy of the letter dated 6th December, 2016 issued under the signatures of Assistant Engineer (Bldg)-I, Shahdara (South Zone),

W.P.(C)11737/2016

page 1 of 2

whereby the application submitted by the writ petitioner on 23rd November, 2016 has been rejected, informing as under:

“In view of the above it is informed that with the instant application, above said requisite fee and development charges have not been deposited, as such this application cannot be treated as valid and has been rejected by the competent authority.

However, it is informed that you may deposit the requisite charges by way of Demand Draft drawn in favour of “Commissioner EDMC”, so that application could be re-open and processed accordingly.”

4. Learned counsel for EDMC submits that as and when the application is received for regularization accompanied with necessary charges the same shall be processed.

5. Learned Senior Counsel for the writ petitioners submit that in view of the submission made by learned counsel for EDMC and communication dated 6th December, 2016 this writ petition may be disposed of as the writ petitioners will comply with the directions contained therein.

6. In view of the above submissions nothing survives for consideration. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

CM No.46224/2016 (stay)

The application is dismissed as infructuous.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

DECEMBER 15, 2016

‘hkaur’