



\$~72

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 5094/2025 & CM APPL. 23325/2025 (*ad-interim ex-parte order*)
BHAGWAN SINGH & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. M.N. Siddiqui, Advocate.

versus
GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Standing
Counsel for DDA with Mr. Bir
Inder Singh Gurm & Ms. Kavya
Shukla, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **22.04.2025**

1. The petitioners claim to be residents of Lado Sarai Village, New Delhi. Although no documents in support of this contention have been placed on record, they have filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, stating that they are aggrieved by the allotment of a portion of land in the vicinity for construction of Sri Aurobindo College. It may be noted that Sri Aurobindo College has not been impleaded as a party in the writ petition.

2. In any event, the petitioners' contention is that a road which is used by them for ingress and egress to the village, namely Chaudhary Himmat Singh Marg, has been blocked by construction debris. In the course of argument, Mr. M.N. Siddiqui, learned counsel for the petitioners, states that construction of College has not, in fact, commenced, and construction material is being placed on said road from other construction sites. If that is so, I am at a loss to understand how the relief sought in this



writ petition for restoration of access to the said road, and the direction against the allotment of land to the College are related to each other.

3. Be that as it may, Mr. Siddiqui, limits the relief sought in this writ petition, to a liberty to the petitioners to make a representation to the concerned authorities of the respondents, and to the concerned Station House Officer [“SHO”], for a method of ingress and egress from their property to be provided. It may be noted that in the writ petition, the petitioners have stated that an alternative road has been provided, but is inadequate. They have also made representations to the Delhi Development Authority, the Lieutenant Governor of Delhi, and the Chief Minister, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi, on 02.04.2025 and 07.04.2025.

4. As the petitioners have limited their relief in the aforesaid terms, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that, if the petitioners seek any specific directions with regard to ingress or egress from their properties, or if any other inconvenience is caused to them, they may make a representation to the respondent authorities or to the concerned SHO. This Court has not made any comment upon the merits of such a representation. It is for the authorities to consider the petitioners’ request as also provide appropriate redressal of the same, keeping all relevant factors in mind.

5. The writ petition, alongwith the pending application, is disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 22, 2025/‘pv/JM’/