



\$~97

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

+ **W.P.(C) 15929/2023**

AAM AADMI PARTY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul Mehra, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Prateek K. Chadha,
Ms. Mani Gupta, Mr. Talha Abdul
Rehman, Mr. Chaitanya Gosain,
Ms. Sonali Jain and Mr. Sreekar
Aechuri, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with
Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Mr. Varun
Rajawat, Mr. Ranjeev Khatana and
Mr. Varun Pratap Singh, Advocates
for Union.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

ORDER
16.07.2024

%

CM APPL. 39659/2024 *(on behalf of the R-2 seeking extension of time for
complying with the directions passed by this Hon'ble Court vide judgment
dated 05.06.2024)*

1. Through the instant application, Respondent No. 2, Directorate of
Estates, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India, seeks
extension of time by four weeks to comply with the directions passed by this
Court *vide* order dated 5th June, 2024.



2. Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC, states that since a new Government has been formed pursuant to the declaration of results for the General Elections 2024 on 4th June, 2024, many Members of Parliament have been appointed as Cabinet Minister(s)/ Minister(s) in the newly formed Government. As such, Respondent No. 2 has been heavily occupied in the process of allocating allotments/ vacating allotments/ regularizing accommodation from the General Pool to the various members of the parliament, especially since many Cabinet Minister(s)/ Minister(s) have been changed and new State Ministers have also been appointed. Mr. Singh submits that this allocation/reallocation of accommodations is a monumental task undertaken by the Respondent No. 2 and it is the reason why there has been a delay in complying with this Court's directions dated 5th June 2024. In light of the above, Respondent No. 2 seeks an extension of 4 weeks in order to comply with the said directions issued by this Court.

3. Mr. Rahul Mehra, Senior Counsel for the Petitioner, strongly opposes the request for extension. He submits that the time period to comply with the Court's directions expires tomorrow, i.e., 17th July, 2024 and if Respondent No. 2 was facing difficulty in complying with the directions of the Court, they could have approached the Court earlier. Therefore, the Respondent No. 2 should not be granted any extension of time. Mr. Mehra further points out that while the Supreme Court were considering a similar case being Civil Appeal No(s). 1867/2006 titled ***Malik Mazhar Sultan & Anr. v. U.P. Public Service Commission Through its Secretary & Ors.***, on 10th June, 2024, Respondent No. 2 made no such submission for extension of time on account of heavy workload before the Supreme Court. Mr. Mehra submits that the instant application for extension of time cannot be sustained and if



the decision is not rendered in time, it would be *fait accompli* as the Petitioner would be without any remedy to assail the decision if the same is rendered against Petitioner.

4. Having considered the aforementioned submissions, since substantial time has already been granted to Respondent No. 2, to comply with the Court's directions, their request for extension of time for four weeks, cannot be accepted. However, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the time period for complying with the Court's directions, is extended till 25th July, 2024. The Court expects that no other application seeking further extension of time shall be presented by Respondent No. 2.

5. In the above directions, the instant application is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JULY 16, 2024

nk