

\$~7

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 11177/2015 & C.M. Nos.29080/2015, 30182/2015,
9515/2016, 26717/2016

M/S SHASHVAT ADVERTISING PVT. LTD.

..... Petitioner
Through Mr.Anand Mishra, Mr Hemant
Kumar, Advocates.

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION & ANR

..... Respondents
Through Mr.Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Mukesh Gupta, Mr.Govind Kumar,
Mr. Pranay Jain and Mr. Sachin
Gupta, Advocates for SDMC.
Mr.Ajjay Aroraa, Mr. Kapil Dutta,
Ms.Diksha Lal, Advocates for North
DMC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

14.02.2017

Petitioner M/s Shashvat Advertising Pvt. Ltd. is aggrieved by the cancellation/withdrawal order issued by respondent no.1/SDMC cancelling his NOCs; submission is that this was without assigning any reason to him; this order was communicated to him vide e-mail dated 23.5.2015; he had sought setting aside of this e-mail.

The averments in the petition disclose that the petitioner had been granted wall wrap advertisement rights in terms of the outdoor

policy of the year 2007 (OAP 2007). Submission is that the petitioner had earlier filed a Civil Suit (being Civil Suit No.123/2012) against the arbitrary act of the respondent in removing his advertisements without following due process of law. Between 2008 to 2011 the petitioner had been granted 18 NOCs to display his advertisements. By a common e-mail dated 23.5.2015 all advertisers including the present petitioner had been informed that their NOCs qua advertisement through wall wraps had been withdrawn; this was an arbitrary act on behalf of the Department; hence the present petition.

The stand of the respondent is clear. It is evident from their counter affidavits. They are the South DMC and North DMC as permissions had been granted by both the South DMC and the North DMC to the petitioner to display his advertisements. There are 18 sites which had been granted to the petitioner. All these permissions had been granted in the year 2008, 2010-2011 except three permissions which had been granted in the year 2013 and one permission was of the year 2014. The last permission of the year 2014 is dated 21.7.2014. It is an admitted position that in view of the judgment of a Bench of this Court decided on 16.9.2016 in WP(C) 6105/2015 titled as Pareena Estate Vs. SDMC these permissions which had been granted for display of advertisements through wall wrap are yearly permissions and this is clear from the reading of para 13 of the aforementioned judgment. This being the position all these NOCs which had been granted in favour of the petitioner have now come to an end by efflux of time.

It is thus clear that nothing survives in this petition. This

petition having been rendered infructuous it is disposed of accordingly.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

FEBRUARY 14, 2017
ndn