

\$~11

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

+ W.P.(C) 6197/2017 & CM APPL. No. 25780/2017

HAJI JAMIL AKHTAR ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. M. Ishteyaque Ahmad &  
Mr. Islam Khan, Advs.

versus

COMMISSIONER OF M C D (NORTH) AND ORS ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Vasundhara Nayyar, Adv. for R1  
& R2.

Mr. Amish Dabas, Adv. for R-6.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI**

**ORDER**

% **20.02.2019**

The petitioner's grievance is in relation to an unlicensed poultry shop and *kabari* shop (scrap dealer shop) being run from premises No. 147, Khasra No. 132, Ground Floor, near Hanuman Chowk, Wazirabad Village, Delhi.

2. During the pendency of petition, the petitioner has filed a *fresh address*, stating that the said unlicensed poultry shop has been re-located from premises No. 147 to premises No. 141 Ground Floor in the same locality.

3. Status reports dated 28.08.2017 and 05.02.2018 filed by respondents Nos. 1 and 2/North DMC state that while action against running the unlicensed poultry shop was taken against respondent No. 3, such business was thereafter closed and then again recommenced from a different location. As per the last status report, no poultry shop has been found being run from the subject premises as of February, 2018.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner however disputes the contents of status report and states that a poultry shop is still being run from the place

by the errant respondent who has shifted his business to House No. A-141 in the same locality. The issue of licensing of the poultry shop apart, running a poultry shop from premises where it is not permissible to do so, would amount to misuse of such premises.

5. In view of the petitioner's grievance made in the petition, it transpires that in compliance of orders of the Supreme Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 4677/1985 titled ***M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India & Ors***, the Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs ("MHUA") of the Government of India has *vide* Office Memorandum dated 25.04.2018 constituted a Special Task Force to comprehensively address violations of the provisions of the Unified Building Bye Laws and Master Plan for Delhi-2021 relating *inter alia* to construction activity and land-use in Delhi. *Vide* another Office Memorandum dated 23.05.2018 the MHUA has also formulated an action plan for monitoring construction activities in Delhi and for fixing responsibility in case of violations of the Unified Building Bye Laws and the Master Plan.

6. *Vide* order dated 20.09.2018 made in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1807/2018 titled ***Devender vs. Government of NCT of Delhi & Ors***. (and connected matters) by the Division Bench of this Court headed by Hon'ble the Chief Justice, the Court has held that in view of the setting-up of the Special Task Force under directions of the Supreme Court it is not appropriate for our court to exercise jurisdiction in matters relating to unauthorised construction; and has disposed of such matters granting liberty to the petitioners to raise their grievances before the Special Task Force so constituted, in accordance with the scheme and procedure formulated under the aforesaid two Office Memorandums.

7. By order dated 24.09.2018 made in a subsequent matter, being Writ Petition (Civil) No. 9938/2018 titled ***Suresh Chand Goel vs. East Delhi Municipal Corporation***, the Division Bench has followed its earlier order dated 20.09.2018 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1807/2018, similarly disposing of the writ petition, granting liberty to the petitioner to file a complaint before the Special Task Force. I am informed that the Division Bench has subsequently also made similar orders in other matters.

8. To be sure, the petitions that were subject matter of the aforesaid proceedings before the Division Bench were petitions filed *in public interest and otherwise*; and related to contravention *not only of sanctioned building plans but also of various laws*, including the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957, the Delhi Development Authority Act, 1957, the New Delhi Municipal Council Act, 1994, the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 and the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, 1904 as also encroachment on public land etc.

9. Ergo, the binding observation of the Division Bench that in view of the setting-up of the Special Task Force under directions of the Supreme Court it is *not* appropriate for our court to exercise jurisdiction in such matters, *must not* in my view, be restricted *only* to matters relating to unauthorised construction but *must also apply to all other matters* which the Special Task Force is mandated to deal with, including misuse and encroachment. In many instances, it may well be that there are multiple violations of Building Bye Laws and Master Plan in the same property, say unauthorised construction, encroachment as well as misuser of premises; in which case the same agency must be left to deal with such connected issues. I should think it is for this reason that the objectives of the Special Task

Force as enunciated in Office Memorandum dated 25th April 2018 include *inter-alia* matters relating to encroachment, unauthorised construction and use violations.

10. The aforesaid Special Task Force is a 15-member body with representation of the highest level from all concerned municipal, civic, revenue and law enforcement agencies of Delhi; and is therefore ideally suited for multi-agency, coordinated action against the rampant malaise of breach of various laws, rules and regulations governing building construction and land-use in Delhi.

11. I am informed that as of date the Special Task Force even has its own dedicated website and mobile application to facilitate making of complaints, thereby making it even easier for parties to take their grievances before the said agency.

12. Accordingly, I am of the view that the correct course of action in this matter also would be to dispose of the present writ petition, giving liberty to the petitioner to approach the Special Task Force in accordance with the policy and procedure laid down for the purpose in MHUA's Office Memorandums dated 25.04.2018 and 23.05.2018 and avail the said alternate, efficacious remedy.

13. This writ petition is disposed of in the above terms.

14. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

**ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J.**

**FEBRUARY 20, 2019/uj**