



\$~95

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

Date of Decision: 17th February, 2025

+ CONT.CAS(C) 61/2025

SHAQIB

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sushil Kumar Jain, Advocate
(Through VC).

versus

SHRI. ASHWANI KUMAR AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Arjun Mahajan, Standing Counsel
for DDA with Mr. Apoorv Upmanyu,
Mr. Harsh Vashisht and Mr. Hari
Mohan, Advocates for STF, DDA.
Mr. Kapil Dutta and Mr. Vansh Luthra,
Advocates for MCD.
Mr. Shekhar Dasi, Mr. MD. Talha and
Mr. Ayush Dassi, Advocates for R-7.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Sh. Sushil Kumar Jain, learned counsel for petitioner appears through *video conferencing*.
2. There is appearance from the side of respondent No.1 MCD, respondent No.2 STF/DDA and respondent No.7, who is stated to be the owner/ builder of P-100, Nafees Road, Pehlwan Chowk, Batla House, Jamia Nagar, New Delhi – 110025.
3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the MCD submits that nothing survives in the present contempt petition. He submits that the petitioner had filed W.P.(C). 15051/2024 and the learned Division Bench, while observing that the writ petition was premature, dismissed



the same. However, at the same time, the respondents were directed to dispose of the representations of the petitioner, which were dated 30.09.2024 and 15.10.2024 in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

4. It is informed by learned counsel for MCD that these representations have already been decided by them and a communication to that effect has also been sent to the petitioner on 16.01.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that if so directed by the Court, he would file a status report in this regard along with the copy of communication dated 16.01.2025 *vide* which they had disposed of the representations of the petitioner. It is also undertaken that complete copy thereof shall also be sent to learned counsel for the petitioner on his designated Email ID i.e. sushiljain2107@gmail.com. Let it be done during the course of the day.

6. In view of the above, nothing further survives in the present contempt petition.

7. Needless to say, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the manner in which his representations have been disposed of, he is always at liberty to take appropriate remedial action as permissible under law.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 17, 2025/nd