

\$~119

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of decision: 16th January, 2019

+ W.P.(C) 423/2019 & CM APPL. 1929/2019 (*for stay*)
CM APPL. 1930/2019 (*for exemption*)

RAVI LOHAR & Ors. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Mishra,
Mr. Rohit Kalra, Mr. Rahul Kumar and Mr.
Ashish Pal, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhanesh Relan, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Mrinalini Sharma, Advs.
for R-1

Ms. Mini Pushkarana, Standing Counsel for
DUSIB/R-2 with Ms. Shiva Pandey and

Ms. Swagata Bhuyan, Advs.

Ms. Nishima Arora, Adv. for Mr. Sanjay
Dewan, Adv. for R-3 & 4

Mr. Akhil Mittal, Standing Counsel for R-5

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

ORDER (ORAL)

%

16.01.2019

1. This writ petition is filed by 22 petitioners who claim to be

residents of the Lohar Jhuggie, Wazirpur Gaon, Opposite Pani ki Tanki, Near Murga Market, Ashok Vihar. The only assertion in this writ petition, which can be said to found any cause of action, warranting resort to the jurisdiction of this Court, is the averment to the effect that the slums of the petitioners would be demolished, without any notice to them.

2. Mr. Relan, learned counsel appearing for the respondent rightly points out that the writ petition is completely vague. No person, who has held out any such threat to the petitioners, is identified or named. Admittedly, there is no written communication received by the petitioners, directing them to vacate the premises in their occupation or threatening demolition of the said premises.

3. It is not possible for this Court to exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction on such vague allegations, as it would amount to this Court carrying out a fishing and roving inquiry which is outside the province of Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

4. A similar writ petition, i.e. ***W.P. (C) 13880/2018 (Radha v. DDA)***, was disposed of, by me, on 28th December, 2018, reserving liberty to the petitioner to re-approach this Court with sufficiently concrete details, and observing that the respondent would not act in any manner, except as is duly sanctified by law, and following due process and the procedure established by law in that regard.

5. This writ petition is also disposed of in the same terms.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J

JANUARY 16, 2019

bh

