

\$~27

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

+ W.P.(C) 1964/2017

M/S STARLINE SECURITY SERVICES PVT. LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Sunil Kumar Sharma, Adv.

versus

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION THROUGH ITS
COMMISSION & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Ms.Mini Pushkarana, Standing
Counsel with Ms.Namrata Mukim,
Ms.Anushruti and Ms. Vasundhara
Nayyar, Advocates for R-1 and
R-2/North DMC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **03.03.2017**

C.M. Nos.8703-04/2017 (exemption)

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

W.P.(C) 1964/2017

Petitioner before this Court has been allotted a parking site at Jwalaheri Market, Paschim Vihar (Rohini Zone), New Delhi. This was in terms of letter dated 15.12.2016. Due to wide spread encroachments and hindrances created by local Market Association the petitioner could use only a very small portion of the parking site in question and has suffered a huge financial loss. He had written several communications to the respondent/North DMC but was no

solution in sight. Learned counsel for petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to the communication dated 23.12.2016 wherein respondent no.1 was informed the local police the submission of the petitioner which was to the effect that the Market Association of the area was not allowing him to run this parking site. Respondent no.1 had requested the local police/SHO to take action against the said persons. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact a local commissioner should be appointed to go to inspect the site and report the position at the site.

Learned counsel for the respondent nos.1 and 2/North DMC has put in appearance. Her submission is that a similar grievance has been raised by the same petitioner in WP(C) 1447/2017 which petition had been disposed of on 17.02.2017. The Court in that petition also had not acceded to the prayer made by the petitioner that a local commissioner be appointed.

This Court is of the view that the order passed in that petition may be passed in this petition as well. This Court is of the view that the averments made in the writ petition may be treated as representation of the petitioner before the Department and the Department will answer the same in accordance with law within a period of three weeks from today. The contention of the petitioner that it is the Local Market Association which is creating these hindrances shall be specifically dealt with as this appears largely to be an admission by respondent no.1 in its letter dated 23.12.2016 wherein the local police station was informed about the hurdle created by the Local Market Association.

The respondent/Department will answer the representation of the petitioner in the background of this factual scenario. No further orders are called for in this petition.

Petition disposed of.

Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

MARCH 03, 2017

ndn