

\$~56

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

+ W.P.(C) 7792/2018

VIVEK TANDON

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Tanveer Ahmad, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Counsel for the respondents
(appearance not given).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

27.07.2018

CM No. 29898/2018

1. Allowed subject to all exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 7792/2018

3. Issue notice. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents accepts notice.
4. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

“a). Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or directions against the respondent no. 2 herein, directing him to refund the unlocked and unused E-court fee bearing no.DLCT2247C1836M172 dated 23.03.2018 for amount Rs. 2,70,000/- (Two Lakh Seventy Thousand Only) issue in the name of petitioner.”

5. It is the petitioner's case that he had applied for requisite court fee on 22.03.2018. However, he subsequently decided not to institute the proceedings for which the court fee had been procured.
6. The petitioner now seeks refund of the said court fee. The petitioner's grievance is that despite approaching the office of respondent no.2, the petitioner has been unable to secure any satisfactory response.
7. Plainly, if the petitioner has not used the court fee, the same should be refunded to him. The concerned authorities shall examine the petitioner's request for the same and process his application as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of four weeks from today. In the event the respondents are of the view that the court fee cannot be refunded, the concerned authorities shall pass a reasoned order and communicate the same to the petitioner. Needless to mention that if aggrieved, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail of such remedies as available in law.
8. The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 27, 2018
MK