



\$~94

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 2503/2025 & CM APPL. 11860/2025**
MAYANK VALECHA

.....Petitioner
Through: Ms. Chandni Arora with Mr.
Gagandeep Singh and Mr. Sarabjeet
Singh, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ORS.

.....Respondent
Through: Ms. Kritika Gupta, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
27.02.2025

%

1. Petitioner claims himself to be the owner of property bearing No. 1, area measuring (20' X 67'), out of Khasra No. 409, area of Village Malikpur, Chhawani, situated at G.T. Karnal Road, Delhi. It was purchased by him in the year 2013 and according to him, he was running his business under the name and style of *Poonam Enterprises*. He was running a warehouse and storing his goods in the above said property.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is to the effect that on 18.11.2024, the officials of respondent Authority came along with Police Force and sealed the property. It is agitated that such *sealing activity* has been done without issuing any *show-cause notice* and also in absence of the petitioner. When petitioner approached DDA and enquired as to why the property had been sealed, he did

W.P.(C) 2503/2025

1



not get any satisfactory answer.

3. The present writ petition has, thus, been filed with request to direct the respondent to desal the above property as sealing has been done without issuing any notice to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for respondent appears on advance notice and submits that the entire stretch in question i.e. area of Malikpur, Chhawani, is having unauthorized construction and such property now vests with DDA.

5. She also submits that the petitioner has not given the exact description of his property and no photograph of the property or, for that matter, any photograph showing it to be sealed, has been annexed with the petition.

6. She, however, submits that without prejudice to their rights and contentions, DDA would certainly look into the grievance of the petitioner and would take appropriate decision in this regard as well. She, however, also supplements that before taking any such action, as per requirement of law, *show-cause notice* is issued.

7. After hearing argument for some time, learned counsel for petitioner submits that he would have no objection if the present writ petition is directed to be treated as a representation and DDA is directed to dispose that of in a time-bound manner.

8. In view of the above, the present writ petition is directed to be treated as a representation and the respondent Authority is directed to consider the same, in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from today.

9. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case, it is expected that respondent Authority shall also give opportunity of personal hearing to petitioner/representative of petitioner, before taking any final decision in the matter.



10. Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

11. Learned counsel for petitioner also submits that since the sealing activity had been done, all of a sudden, and without any prior notice, the goods of petitioner are lying in the above said warehouse and, at least, DDA should permit them to remove those goods in the interregnum.

12. Learned counsel for DDA undertakes to consider the above said aspect also before taking any final decision in the matter. She also highlights that no such fact was mentioned in the petition and, therefore, she could not take any instruction in this regard from the Department.

13. It is, however, clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion with respect to the merits of the case and all the rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

14. Needless to say, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the outcome of his such representation, he would be at liberty to take recourse to other remedial action, as permissible under law.

15. A copy of this order be given *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

MANOJ JAIN, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2025/sw/ss