$~47

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

\+ W.P.(C) 10523/2018

DR ANITA PATNAIK ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Harsh Ahuja and Mr Kushal Kumar, Advocates.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL AND ORS. ..... Respondents

Through: Ms Malvika Trivedi, Standing Counsel with Mr Tushar Sannu, ASC for New Delhi Municipal Corporation.
Mr Rakesh Kumar, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

O R D E R

% 28.11.2018

CM No.48881/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

REVIEW PET.422/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present review petition seeking review of the order dated 03.10.2018, whereby the petition was dismissed in default as well as on merits. The learned counsel appearing for New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) had submitted that the petitioner was allotted a flat from the inter-pool exchange, which was being renovated to make it habitable. It was further stated that the petitioner had not applied for accommodation from the NDMC pool and if she did so she would be allotted a flat from that

pool.

3. The petitioner has premised the present review petition, *inter alia*, on the basis that, the statement made by the learned counsel appearing for NDMC that the petitioner had not applied to NDMC seeking accommodation from the NDMC Pool, is incorrect. In view of the above, the petitioner was granted an opportunity to substantiate the claim that she had applied for accommodation from the NDMC Pool and the present petition was adjourned for the said reason.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to produce any document to substantiate the assertion that the petitioner had applied for accommodation from the NDMC Pool. It is, thus, clear that the statement made by the learned counsel for the NDMC that the petitioner had not applied for the NDMC Pool, is correct.

5. In view of the above, this Court does not consider it appropriate to entertain the present petition. The same is dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

NOVEMBER 28, 2018
MK