

\$~21

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 804/2017
A.K. CHOPRA

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Anand Mishra, Advocate.

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (SDMC)

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Mukesh Gupta, Mr. Chetan
Gautam and Mr. Pranay Jain,
Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **01.02.2017**

C.M.No.3996/2017 (exemption)

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

W.P.(C) 804/2017

Petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that his representation made to the Department and pending before the Department since 21.7.2016 has not yet been decided.

On advance notice, learned counsel for respondent has put in appearance.

Photographs to substantiate the averment of the petitioner have been placed on record. His submission is that these are self signage which have been placed by him on the building. This is hotly disputed by the respondent.

This Court is not inclined to pass any observation on the merits of the controversy as this Court is of the opinion that it would be appropriate that the respondent/Competent Authority to decide the representation of the petitioner. Accordingly, it is ordered that the representation of the petitioner dated 21.7.2016 pending before the Department be decided by a speaking order within an outer limit of four weeks from today.

Petition disposed of.

Needless to state that if the petitioner is aggrieved may move to the Court for appropriate remedy.

Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

FEBRUARY 01, 2017

ndn

At this stage Mr.Mukesh Gupta, counsel for respondent under instructions from Mr.Naresh Kumar, Advertisement Inspector, South Zone, SDMC submits that the order on the representation of the petitioner has already been passed yesterday i.e. on 31.01.2017; copy of this order will be communicated to the petitioner in the course of the day. Petitioner may take appropriate steps.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

FEBRUARY 01, 2017

ndn