

\$~13

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 822/2016 and CM No. 8590/2016
JAGDISH KAUR PARMAR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Avneesh Gar, Mr. Pravin Sharma
and Ms. Kanika Sharma, Advocates

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Ajay Digpaul, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Madhuri Dhingra, Advocate
For R-1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

24.03.2017

Petition had been disposed of on 03.02.2017. Matter has been listed for directions qua action taken by the respondent Corporation qua the property of the petitioner. The said status report is on record. It has been perused. It has been pointed that the demolition order qua the property of the petitioner has been passed on 16.03.2017 and all action which is further mandated under law shall be completed against the said property. Copy of this status report has been furnished to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that pursuant to the order dated 03.02.2017 he had been constrained to file a contempt petition; that contempt petition had been disposed of; contention of

the petitioner all along being that a wrong statement had been made on oath by the respondent counsel as action in accordance with law had not been taken in terms of the statement dated 03.02.2017.

Respondent no.2 is present in person. Her submission is that the petitioner is a permanent resident of America; the petitioner through his attorney holder is pressurizing her time and again to sell the property to the petitioner which is against her will; this Court had noted this contention of respondent no.2 even on the last date.

Be that as it may, noting the status report which has been taken on record no further orders are called for in this petition.

At this stage, respondent no.2 points out that she has received a notice from the South Delhi Municipal Corporation / respondent no.1 charging an amount of Rs. 50,000/- as the demolition charges for the demolition of the unauthorized construction on her property; she finds it difficult to pay this amount as she has a huge financial constraint; apart from the fact that she is living by herself and doing a private job, she also has a teenaged daughter to support. Learned counsel for the respondent no.1 submits that as and when an application in this regard is moved by respondent no.2 before the Corporation, the same shall be considered in accordance with law.

Petition disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

MARCH 24, 2017

gb