

\$~2

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 680/2015 & CM No.6093/2015

RANJEET JHA

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr.Kamal Kant Jha, Advocate.

versus

**THE COMMISSIONER, SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION & ANR**

..... Respondents

Through : Ms.Diksha Lal, Advocate for
Ms.Ajjay Aroraa, Advocate for
SDMC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YOGESH KHANNA

ORDER

%

02.05.2017

The petitioner's grievance is that the respondent – SDMC's action in seeking enforcement of the demand for payment of the arrears of the licence is arbitrary. He relies upon certain letters to say that the area actually given under the parking licence agreement awarded to it was smaller than what it was originally agreed, as a result of which collections were lower.

Respondents counter affidavit dispute these facts and relies upon the petitioner's collections – which according to it were very high and also revision of rates.

After some hearing, learned counsel for petitioner submitted that he would avail of civil remedies with respect to the correctness and legality of the demands raised by the respondents as well as the area actually allotted and occupied by it, towards which the licence fees could have been validly recovered.

In the event the petitioner approaches the Civil Court with respect to any dispute concerning the demands and other connected disputes i.e. subject matter of these proceedings rights and contentions of parties in that regard are reserved.

The writ petition and miscellaneous application are disposed of in terms of above observations.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

YOGESH KHANNA, J

MAY 02, 2017

M