

\$~3

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

+ **W.P.(C) 70/2018 & C.M. Nos.322-323/2018**

NEELAM GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through Ms. Ekta Sikri, Advocate with
Mr.Pranav Sharma and Mr.Junaid
Nahvi, Advocates.

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION &ORS

..... Respondent

Through Mr.Mukesh Gupta, Standing Counsel
with Ms.Shashi Gupta, Advocate for
R-1.
S.I. Ajay Kumar, P.S.Rajouri Garden.
Mr.Ishvinder Singh, Advocate for R-
3.
Ms.Jyoti Taneja, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

17.01.2018

Ms. Jyoti Taneja, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.2 wishes to place on record a short affidavit pointing out that the requisite demolition has already been carried out. The said affidavit is taken on record. Ms.Ekta Sikri, counsel appearing for the petitioner, confirms the fact that demolition as prayed for has been carried out.

Mr.Ishvinder Singh, learned counsel for respondent no. 3 submits that after the aforesaid demolition, the respondent no.3 does

not propose to carry out any construction without getting any sanction from the requisite authority.

Mr.Mukesh Gupta, appearing for respondent no.1 submits that in view of the fact that the demolition was carried out recently, the Malba could not be removed from the site. He however assures the Court that the Malba will be removed as expeditiously as possible.

In view of the statements made above, nothing further survives in the writ petition as the prayers of the petitioner stand satisfied.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed off alongwith pending applications.

REKHA PALLI, J

JANUARY 17, 2018

sr