

\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 12213/2016

JIVAN LAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Dhirander Mathur, Adv.

versus

THE COMMISSIONER, SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Surender Sinha, standing counsel
with Mr. Amit Saxena, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **09.01.2017**

The petitioner is aggrieved by inaction on the part of the statutory authority. His submission is that the work orders dated 26.07.2016, 28.07.2016 and 15.09.2016 had been issued by the Department to the contractor for carrying out the necessitated work at Harkesh Nagar but these work orders inspite of the time limit having been expired, have not been completed. This is the grievance of the petitioner.

On advance notice, learned counsel for the respondent/SDMC has put in appearance. His submission is that even as per the petitioner, the work orders had been completed in part; his additional submission is that this writ petition may be treated as representation and the queries made in this petition be answered in accordance with law by the Department.

This writ petition is accordingly treated as a representation qua the petitioner. The respondent Corporation will answer the averments made in the writ petition and inform the petitioner as to what action has been taken on the aforementioned work orders and in case the work orders have not been completed, it will ensure that the work orders be completed expeditiously.

With these directions, petition disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JANUARY 09, 2017

A