



\$~57

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

+ **W.P.(C) 11648/2024**

**MANOJ KUMAR JAIN**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajit Singh, Adv.

versus

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI**

.....Respondent

Through: Counsel (appearance not given).

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

**23.08.2024**

%

1. The petitioner in the instant petition seeks to challenge an order passed by the respondent-Municipal Corporation of Delhi which has rejected the petitioner's application for regularization. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has contended that all irregularities in the subject property have been rectified by the petitioner himself and there remains no irregularity in the subject property. The petitioner further contended that the action against his property taken by the respondent-MCD is initiated at the instance of a neighbour who allegedly seeks to settle personal scores.

2. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

3. Upon an examination of the controversy, it can be seen that there exists a remedy under the provisions of Section 347-B of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 to assail the impugned order before the



Appellate Tribunal-MCD. In view of the aforesaid, the Court declines to entertain the instant writ petition and instead grants liberty to the petitioner to take necessary remedy in accordance with law.

4. Leaving all rights and contentions open in favour of the petitioner, the instant petition stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**AUGUST 23, 2024/KG**