



\$~39

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 8486/2017, CM APPL. 14460/2023**

MARKET ASSOCIATION OF NEETI BAGHPetitioner

Through: **Mr. Harsh Pal, Adv.**

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL AND ORS.Respondent

Through: **Mr. Aayush Agarwala, Mr. Nilesh Kumar, Advs.**
Ms. Kanika Agnihotri, ASC for DDA,
with Mr. Sachin Sharma, Mr. Satvik Rai, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

14.08.2024

1. This petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-

“(a) Pass an order issuing an appropriate writ of mandamus or any other writ, order or direction. directing the Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 to take action as per law against the misuse of the Community Hall situated at Neeti Bagh Colony, New Delhi;

(b) Pass a writ / order / direction restraining the Respondent nos. 3 and 4 from misusing the Community Hall of the Neetibagh Colony, New Delhi including in the manner as mentioned in para 2(viii) of the present petition;”

2. The official respondent no.1 has placed on record its status report and in paragraph no.2 has taken following position:-

“That considering the relief as sought by the petitioner in respect of the Community Centre/ Hall / Neeti Bagh Club in the instant writ



petition so far as it pertains to Health Department of South Zone of respondent, South Delhi Municipal Corporation, it is submitted that as per record the society under the name and style Secretary Supreme Court Bar Co operative House Building Society Ltd. is having the licenses for running the canteen and refreshment room catering / coffee house / cold drink / non alcoholic drink / aerated water / eating house and in respect of the alleged Swimming Pool. The copy of the licenses as obtained / issued in this regard are annexed herewith as Annexure -A (Colly-A)”

3. Despite the same has been placed on record on 24.10.2017, there is no rebuttal to the averments made therein. The matter was also adjourned on various dates on one pretext or the other.
4. Having considered the grievance raised in the instant writ petition and the stand taken by the official respondent, the Court is not inclined to keep this petition pending on its Board and instead grants the liberty to the petitioner to make appropriate representation to the respondent-Corporation in case the petitioner has any further grievance with respect to any of the activities.
5. With the aforesaid observation, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

AUGUST 14, 2024/KG