



\$~85

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4521/2025 & CM APPL. 20898/2025**

VINISH MITTAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. M.S. Khan, Mr. Akbar Kaleem
and Mr. M. Arslyan, Advocates with
petitioner in person.
Mob: 9818416099

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nitin Bhutani, Advocate for R-2
and 3.
Mob: 9953572757
Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv for
Respondent no. 2 & 3
Ms. Gauri Dixit and Mr. S.D. Dixit,
Advocates
Mob: 9312832910
Mr. Rajat Aneja and Ms. Jyoti
Nambiar, Advocates for R-4 and 5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

08.04.2025

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed for directions to demolish the entire construction of Phase 2, 3 and 4 of Amaryllis, New Rohtak Road, Karol Bagh, Delhi, on the ground that it has violated the norms of Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD"), Sanctioned Plan, National Building Code and the Bylaws.
2. In response, learned counsel appearing for respondent-MCD, on advance notice, has handed over copy of the judgment dated 1st April, 2025,



passed by the Appellate Tribunal, Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“ATMCD”) in *Appeal No. 994/ATMCD/2024*, wherein, the same issues, which have been raised in the present petition, have been dealt with.

3. *Vide* the aforesaid judgment dated 1st April, 2025, the learned ATMCD has dismissed the said appeal, thereby, holding that the comprehensive scheme for group housing project, has been approved by the MCD, as per the extant laws, in consultation and in light of clarification provided by the Delhi Development Authority (“DDA”).

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent-MCD further submits that seven completion certificates for the seven towers in the society in question have been issued by the MCD.

5. Learned counsel appearing for respondent nos. 4 and 5, brings to the notice of this Court, the submissions made by the petitioner in the present petition, wherein, the petitioner has stated that he is the owner of the flat in question occupied by him.

6. It is submitted that the petitioner is only a tenant of the flat, and is in huge default of the dues of the society.

7. In response, the petitioner, who is present in court, submits that this is a typographical error, as earlier there were other petitioners also.

8. This Court has taken a very serious view of the fact that wrong facts are projected before this Court, despite the fact that the petitioner is stated to be a practicing lawyer.

9. This Court notes that in the petition, averments have been made by the petitioner that he is the owner of flat in the Amaryllis, New Rohtak Road, Karol Bagh, Delhi, which is clearly a wrong fact.

10. The said wrong fact, has been reiterated in the petition, time and



again.

11. Further, this Court notes the fact that an appeal raising similar issues, has already been dismissed, and that the MCD has already issued completion certificates.

12. Considering the aforesaid discussion, the present petition is dismissed, with cost of ₹ 20,000/-, to be payable by the petitioner to the Delhi High Court Bar Association, within a period of four weeks from today.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

APRIL 8, 2025

ak