



\$~20

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4220/2023**

KAMAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

**THE COMMISSIONER, MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI
& ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Kamal Singh and Mr. Chatur
Singh, Advocates for R-3.

Mr. Siddhant Nath, Standing Counsel with Mr.
Bhavishya Makhija, Advocate for MCD.

Mr. Avneesh Garg, Mr. Harsh Pat and Ms. Iptisha,
Advocates for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

%

13.01.2025

1. On 08.11.2023, the Court had passed the following order:-

“1. A status report has been filed by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi [“MCD”] in August, 2023, in which it is stated that a staircase in front of the subject property has been demolished. However, in respect of unauthorised construction in the property, it is stated as follows:

“That, the action on unauthorized construction at the above mentioned properties is warranted on the Building Department, MCD, if any.”

2. The status report is filed by the Executive Engineer of MCD, albeit in-charge of the Maintenance Department. MCD ought to have filed a status report, which deals with the entire grievance raised in the writ petition. It is for different departments of MCD to coordinate with each other and file a consolidated status report. MCD is directed to file a further status report within two weeks from today, failing which the concerned Executive Engineers of the Maintenance Department and the Building Department will remain present in Court on the next date of hearing, alongwith the relevant records.



3. Mr. Avneesh Garg, learned counsel for respondent No. 4, states that he has been instructed that the address of the petitioner mentioned in the memo of parties does not exist and that there is no person by the name of Kamal Singh resident in the locality. The petitioner is directed to file an affidavit within one week with his identity documents and proof of address for consideration of the Court.

4. List on 04.03.2024.”

2. From a reading of the order, it is clear that the Petitioner was directed to file an affidavit within one week with his identity, documents and proof of address for consideration of the Court. Neither the order has been complied with nor there is any appearance on behalf of the Petitioner.

3. It appears that the Petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed for non-prosecution.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JANUARY 13, 2025/shivam