



\$~67

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

+ **W.P.(C) 259/2024**

DR. SUBHASH VIJAYRAN

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Harsimran Singh Duggal, Adv.**

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr.Sunil Goyal, ASC with
Ms.Shivani Tayal and Mr.Sumit
Panwar, Advs for MCD.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

06.08.2024

1. The petitioner has prayed for the following relief:-

4.1 Quash and set aside the Rejection Order dated 27.10.2023 of Mr. Mahesh Yadav, Public Health Inspector, Municipal Corporation of Delhi, by which he had rejected the online Death Application No. 0223-1710169195 [Registration No. MCDOLIR-0223-0610180008], dated 17.10.2023, filed online by the Petitioner with the Respondent Corporation.

4.2. Allow the online Death Application No. 0223-1710169195 [Registration No. MCDOLIR-0223-0610180008], dated 17.10.2023, filed online by the Petitioner with the Respondent Corporation and direct the Respondent Corporation to issue the Death Certificate of Late Sh. Jaipal. S/o Late Sh. Ramphal (deceased father of the Petitioner), to the Petitioner, at the earliest.

4.3. Award compensatory and punitive costs of Rs.50,000/- in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondent Corporation, for arbitrarily rejecting the online Death Application No. 0223-1710169195 [Registration No. MCDOLIR-0223-0610180008], dated 17.10.2023, filed by the Petitioner with the Respondent Corporation, resulting in unnecessary and avoidable hardships to the Petitioner.

4.4. Award litigation costs of Rs.10,000/- in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondent Corporation, for not acting upon the



Complaint dated 12.11.2023 of the Petitioner, thereby forcing him to move this Hon'ble Court with the present Writ Petition for redressal of his grievances.

4.5. Pass any other or further order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice and to meet the ends of justice.

2. In view of the fact that the substantive prayer stands mitigated, this Court is not inclined to keep the instant writ petition pending on its Board so far as prayer made in paragraph nos. 4.3 and 4.4 is concerned.
3. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to take appropriate remedy under civil law.
4. In view of the aforesaid, the instant writ petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

AUGUST 6, 2024/MJ