



\$~107

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

% ***Date of Decision: 26th November, 2024***

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1872/2024 & CM APPL. 68855/2024**

SHYAM SUNDER AGGARWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Puneet Goyal, Advocate.**

versus

SH P K SRIVASTATVA (CHIEF COMMISSIONER) & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: **Ms. Tatini Basu, SC for R-1.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner seeks initiation of contempt proceedings for non-compliance of the directions contained in order dated 22.08.2024 passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.(C) No. 11560/2024.
2. This Court has gone through the above said order whereby it was directed as under:-

“4. Ms. Tajinder Viridi, counsel for Municipal Corporation of Delhi, submits that much prior to the Petitioner’s complaint, the MCD has already acted and booked the unauthorised construction on the subject property and are currently in the process of taking appropriate action, in accordance with law.

5. In light of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction that the Respondents No. 1 to 3 shall consider and dispose of the Petitioner’s complaint dated 22nd April, 2024, in accordance with law and inform the outcome of such enquiry to the Petitioner.

6. The Court has not made any comments on the merits of the case. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.”



3. Learned counsel for respondent No. 1 i.e. Central Vigilance Commission appears on advance notice and informs that the matter was referred to MCD for examining the allegations made by the complainant and they have received one *Action Taken Report* dated 21.10.2024 from MCD which clearly indicates that the building in question has already been sealed and is presently uninhabited and the further action of demolition is to be initiated in terms of the above said decision.
4. It is also informed that the above said facts were duly communicated to petitioner herein vide a letter dated 18.11.2024 sent by the Director, Central Vigilance Commission. A complete set thereof has been shown to the Court and a spare set has also been submitted to learned counsel for petitioner.
5. In view of the above, this Court is of the opinion that no further action is required with respect to the present contempt petition.
6. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.
7. However, if petitioner feels himself aggrieved by the aforesaid decision, he is always at liberty to take appropriate action as permissible under law.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 26, 2024/SW