



\$~110

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 12791/2024**
RBL BANK LTDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Amol Sharma, Mr.
Ateev Mathur, Mr. Sanjay
Gupta & Mr. Anmol Metha,
Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND
ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu & Mr.
Hardik Saxena, Advs. for R1.
Mr. Niraj Kumar, SC with Mr.
Chaitanya Kumar, Adv. for R2
with Mr. Ram Dayal Meena,
MCD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

ORDER

% **25.09.2024**
CM APPL. 53332/2024 – EXMP.

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 12791/2024

3. The petitioner, which is a scheduled bank, is invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court for a direction to the respondent No.1/DDA & the respondent No.2/MCD to provide complete records of the commercial property bearing No.52, Block E, Greater Kailash Part-II, New Delhi, 110048.
4. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1/DDA and the



respondent No.2/MCD are present on advance notice.

5. In brief, the case of the petitioner is that it purchased the property in question, the details of which are mentioned herein above, from Mrs. Suman Aggarwal vide a registered Sale Deed dated 05.01.2018. It is stated that the seller, Mrs. Suman Aggarwal, was the owner of the property in question by virtue of the registered Conveyance Deed executed in her favour by the DDA dated 26.11.2009. The grievance of the petitioner is that a notice board has been displayed outside the property recently, which notifies the public as under:-

“S.D.M.C. PROPERTY:MATTER SUBJUDICE UNDER
COURT PROTECTION TRESSPASSERS SHALL BE
PROSECUTED”

6. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1/DDA on instruction submits that the DDA is verifying the genuineness of the status of the Conveyance Deed dated 26.11.2009.

7. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2/MCD submits after taking instruction from Sh. Ram Dayal Meena, School Inspector, Education Department, South Zone, MCD, that they have nothing to do with the property bearing no. E-52, Greater Kailash, Part-II, New Delhi and it is the property bearing no. E-51, Greater Kailash, Part-II which is the property over which the MCD is laying its claims

8. In view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the respondent No.2/MCD, learned counsel for the petitioner requests permission to withdraw the present petition with a right to take appropriate legal steps, if so warranted.

9. It is directed that the disputed board which is put in front of the subject property be removed and the same be placed at any



conspicuous part in front or around of the property bearing no. E-51
Greater Kailash, Part-II.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2024/Ch