



\$~22

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

+ W.P.(C) 3328/2025 & CM APPL. 15751/2025, CM APPL.
19566/2025

MS SANA ALI KHAN THROUGH ITS POWER OF ATTORNEY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Zafar Khurshid and Mr. Ankur
Khurana, Advocates
Mob: 9810271008
Email: khurshidz@gmail.com

versus

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI THROUGH ITS
COMMISSIONER & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Advocate with Mr.
Tarun Verma, Ms. Arzoo Singh and
Ms. Komal Gupta, Advocates for
applicant
Mr. Vikas Chopra, SC for MCD
Mob: 9212036118
Email: chopra.company@gmail.com
Mr. Mayank Dawar, Advocate for R-
4 & 5
Mr. Hemant Chauhan, Advocate for
R-6, 7 and 8.
Mob: 9999036345

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

03.04.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed to pass directions for restraining the respondents with respect to illegal and unauthorised construction being carried out in property, i.e., *Khasra No. 664, admeasuring 2450 sq. yards, situated in the Revenue Estate of Neb Sarai, Hauz Khas, Tehsil Mehrauli,*



New Delhi, and also described as *W-12B/9C Lane, Western Avenue, Sainik Farms, New Delhi*.

2. Today, learned counsel appearing for Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“MCD”), submits that property was inspected on 18th March, 2025, and demolition action was taken on 19th March, 2025. He submits that, during the course of demolition action, one room and boundary wall existing therein, have been demolished, wherein, the construction has been made inhabitable.

3. He submits that no further construction exists, therein.

4. Mr. T. Singhdev, Advocate has put in appearance before this Court and submits that he has filed an application for impleadment, and he represents the owner of the property in question, who is in possession of the same.

5. He submits that the petitioner alleging himself to be the owner, has filed this petition.

6. He further draws the attention of this Court to the signatures, which occur in the affidavit filed along with the present writ petition, and the applications, herein, as well as the signatures occurring in the vakalatnama.

7. By referring to the said signatures, he submits that the actual signatures of the power of attorney, i.e., Faizan Ali Khan, are totally different.

8. He, thus, submits that the signatures, under which the present petition has been filed, are clearly forged.

9. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that various misrepresentations have been made on behalf of the applicant and that no document pertaining to title or possession, has been placed on



record, before this Court.

10. Since the MCD has already made a statement before this Court, as regards the action taken against the unauthorised construction, this Court is of the view that no further orders are required in the present matter.

11. This Court notes that there is no application for impleadment before this Court.

12. However, considering the fact that the present petition is being disposed of on account of the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for MCD, learned counsel appearing for the applicant has been heard by this Court.

13. However, it is further clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion as regards the title, ownership or possession of any of the parties.

14. In case, there is any property dispute between the petitioner and client of Mr. T. Singhdev, the same would be the subject matter of a civil dispute and this Court is not in a position to express any opinion or give any finding with respect thereto, in the present proceedings.

15. Accordingly, noting the aforesaid, the present petition is disposed of, along with the pending applications.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

APRIL 3, 2025

ak