

\$~21

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 8018/2016 & C.M. Nos.33287/2016, 35154/2016,
36796/2016, 37738/2016 & 38976/2016
SAROJINI KAPUR

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Princy Anthony, Adv.

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through Ms. Anju Gupta and Mr. Roshan Lal
Goel, Advs for R-1.
Mr. Arjun Mahajan and Mr. Prateek
Mahajan, Advs for R-2 & R-3.
Mr. Varun Nischal, Adv for Delhi
Police.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

11.01.2017

It is the second call. At the first call, none had appeared for the petitioner. At the second call, a request for adjournment is made. Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 & 3 submit that the construction in the adjoining building already stands completed; all the issues earlier noted and aggrieved for by the petitioner have been addressed and the same have been answered to the satisfaction of the petitioner.

The stand of respondent Corporation is that the plan qua the building constructed by respondents No. 2 & 3 already stands sanctioned. The earlier order-sheets and the grievance of the

petitioner and the manner in which they were addressed by respondent No.3 have also been noted.

This Court is of the view that the grievance of the petitioner having been addressed and the stand of the respondents being clear to the effect that the building of respondents No. 2 & 3 now standing complete which is in terms of the sanction of the plan granted by respondent No. 1 no further orders are called for on this petition. It is disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JANUARY 11, 2017

A