

\$~37

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10396/2018 & CM 40508/2018**

SMT. RIPU DAMAN AND ANR.Petitioners

Through: **Ms. Ellis J.D.Ahuja, Advocate**

versus

THE SUB DIVISIONAL MAGISTRATERespondent

Through: **Ms. Shobhana Takiar, Advocate**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

%

01.10.2018

Impugned order of 25th April, 2018 simply records as under:-

*“As per revenue record of supporting documents
the applicant is not entitled for mutation in revenue
records.*

*Sd/-25/4
SDM-Kalkaji.”*

The challenge to impugned order is on the ground that it is not a speaking order.

Upon hearing, I find that the impugned order is not only non-speaking but it is incoherent. It is accordingly set aside with direction to the concerned SDM to pass a speaking order on petitioners' application (*Annexure-B*) within a period of eight weeks from today and the fate of the application be made known to petitioners within two weeks thereafter, so that petitioners may avail of the remedies as available in law, if need

be. Let the concerned SDM be apprised of this order forthwith, to ensure its compliance.

With aforesaid directions, this petition and the application are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 01, 2018

v