



\$~43

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

+ **W.P.(C) 10112/2024**

BHIM SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vinod Kumar, Adv.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Raghvendra Upadhyay, Panel
Counsel for MCD with Ms. Purnima
Jain and Mr. Vaibhav Tripathi, Advs.
for R-1.
Mr. Kamal Mehta, Adv. DHCLSC for
R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

10.09.2024

%

1. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.3, on instructions, submits that the said respondent has already shifted his dairy to another location.
2. The petitioner, however, submits that there is an apprehension of re-shifting of the dairy to its original place. He, therefore, prays that the official respondents be directed to ensure that respondent No.3 is not allowed to re-shift the dairy to the original place.
3. The Court, at this stage, only records that since the dairy has been shifted to a different place, therefore, the writ petition has rendered



infructuous. However, liberty is accorded to the petitioner to take necessary recourse in accordance with law, in case he realises that respondent No.3 is re-shifting or causing any other obstruction to the petitioner.

4. Respondent No.3, however, shall also be at liberty to take necessary approval before the operation of dairy at a particular place. If that be so, further recourse to take place accordingly.

5. If respondent No.3 applies for an alternate site or otherwise, the same be dealt with as per law.

6. With the aforesaid liberty, the petition stands disposed of.

7. All rights and contentions are left open.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

SEPTEMBER 10, 2024/p