

\$~21

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

+ W.P.(C) No. 9441/2017

MOOL CHAND GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. A.K. Sharma, Adv.

versus

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Saroj, Adv. for North DMC with
SI Tahir Hussain, PS, Bharatnagar.
Mr. Sachin Nahar & Mr. V.P. Nahar,
Advs. for R3, 4 & 5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **11.02.2019**

The petitioner is aggrieved by alleged encroachment on the road opposite Indian Bank, Rana Pratap Bagh, Delhi and opposite post office, Rana Pratap Bagh between Blocks C and D in the said area.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that apart from encroachment by private parties, there is in fact a police booth constructed on a 60 feet wide road, which road is meant for movement of people and vehicles.

Status report dated 10.08.2018 filed by respondent No. 1/North DMC states that two suits are already pending before a civil court in Rohini in relation to the encroachments in the same area, including

removal/demolition of the police booths in question. It is pointed-out that in one of the said two suits, the petitioner's daughter-in-law is the plaintiff. In the status report, it is further stated that respondent No. 1/North DMC has already taken action to remove the encroachments; but since the encroachments are temporary in nature, they keep coming back.

Status report dated 01.02.2019 filed by respondent No. 1/North DMC states that action has been taken yet again.

Status report dated 04.04.2018 has also been filed by respondents Nos. 4 and 5/Delhi Police stating that the police booth in question was built some 18-20 years ago with consent of all neighbouring shopkeepers; and that the petitioner had in fact filed a civil suit to remove the police booth from its present location, which suit was dismissed.

As is evident from the above, while there are contentions and counter-contentions in relation to the subject matter of the petition, the petitioner is not satisfied with the action taken by respondent No. 1/North DMC.

In the context of the 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

This writ petition is disposed of in the above terms.

Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J.

FEBRUARY 11, 2019/uj