

\$~26

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

+ W.P.(C) 12285/2015 and CM Appl. Nos. 32534/2015 & 32535/2015

LAKHAN PAL SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through :Mr. Kamran Malik and Mr. Mobin
Ullah, Advs.

versus

M.C.D. (NORTH) & ORS

..... Respondents

Through :Mr. Kartik Jindal, Adv. for
respondent no. 1
Mr. Siddharth Dutta, Adv. for
respondent no. 2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

25.02.2016

Petitioner is the son of respondent no. 3 and nephew of respondent nos. 4 to 6. Further petitioner was also living in the same premises. Petitioner has alleged that property was vacated on the representation of private respondents that it required renovation and repairs. Instead of repairs respondent nos. 3 to 6 have started raising unauthorised construction. Learned counsel for the private respondents submits that petition is motivated. I need not to delve this point in the facts and circumstances of this case since, as per the respondent, unauthorised construction was noticed in the suit premises and the property has already been booked.

Writ petition is disposed of with the directions to respondent no. 1 to take the action, already taken by it to its logical end, in accordance with law. Compliance report be submitted within six weeks. Miscellaneous applications are disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

FEBRUARY 25, 2016

rb