



\$~35

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9275/2023**

HARMINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Ekta Gambhir and Mr. A.K. Sharma, Advs.

Versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukesh Gupta, SC for MCD with Mr. Shashi Gupta, Mr. Arnav Gupta, Mr. Chirag Chaturvedi and Mr. Ashwini Bhaskar Singh, Advs. Mr. Amit Chadha and Mr. Saurabh Goel, Advs. for R-3 to 5

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

10.09.2024

REVIEW PET. 295/2024 and CM APPLs. 49202/2024, 49203/2024

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in the order dated 26.07.2024, it has been incorrectly recorded that no rejoinder affidavit is on record. According to her, the rejoinder affidavit was placed by the petitioner and the same was indeed on record.
2. The Court has considered the aforesaid submission and modifies paragraph no.4 of the order dated 26.07.2024 and the same shall now be read as:-

“4. Rejoinder affidavit is on record.”



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, therefore, submits that there are multiple anomalies in the Status Report filed by the respondent-MCD.
4. The Court, at this stage, is not inclined to examine the aforesaid intricacies while exercising writ jurisdiction and instead grants liberty to the petitioner to approach the Special Task Force (STF) constituted in terms of the directions passed by the Supreme Court in W.P. (C) 4677/1985 titled as ***M.C. Mehta v. Union of India***. If the petitioner is of the opinion that the stand taken by the respondent-Corporation in the Status Report is factually incorrect or otherwise and requires re-consideration, the petitioner may approach the STF or pursue other alternate remedies.
5. Accordingly, the review petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms, alongwith pending applications.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2024

p'ma