

\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

WP (C) 3155/2020, CM Nos.10964-65/2020

RAJEEV SURI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shikhil Suri and Mr. Shiv Kumar
Suri, Advs.

Versus

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT FORESTS AND CLIMATE
CHANGE (MOEF & CC)

...Respondent

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr.Rohan Anand, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

%

15.05.2020

1. The present application has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.
2. The present petition filed by one Mr. Rajeev Suri, who claims to be a public spirited resident of Delhi seeks the following prayers:-

"I. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction calling for records of Respondent no.1 within one month as stipulated in the Notification of 2006.

II. Issue a writ of mandamus in the nature of order and/or direction (s) calling for the Records of Respondent no.2 to provide names to respondent No.1 as Member and Chairman of SEIAA immediately and not later than a week as stipulated in the Notification of 2006.

III. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction calling for records of Respondent no.1 to notify immediately SEAC for

Respondent No.1 within one month as stipulated in the Notification of 2006.

IV. Issue a writ of mandamus in the nature of order and direction (s) calling for the Records of Respondent no.2 to provide names to respondent no.1 for notifying members of SEAC immediately and not later than a week as stipulated in the Notification of 2006.

V. Issue directions all B Category projects falling under SEIAA jurisdiction in the State of Delhi (GNCTD) will be appraised within a period of 30 + 7 days (required as per Notification for notifying SEIAA and SEAC)

VI. Pass such other further order (s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the interest of justice. "

3. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that before approaching this Court, the petitioner has not made any representation to the respondent no.1 against whom the main relief has been sought in the writ petition and therefore seeks leave to withdraw the petition with liberty to make representations to the respondents, but prays that the respondents be directed to decide the same expeditiously.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition along with pending applications is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for. It is expected that as and when any representation is made by the petitioner, the same would be considered by the respondents expeditiously on its own merits and preferably within six weeks.

5. It is however made clear that this Court has neither examined the merits of the petitioner's claim nor the objection of respondent no.1 that the writ petition is not maintainable in the present form.

6. Needless to say that in case the petitioner is aggrieved by any of

order passed by the respondents, it will be open for him to take legal recourse as permissible under the law.

7. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith. Copy of the order be also forwarded to the learned counsel through email.

REKHA PALLI, J

MAY 15, 2020
SDP