



\$~7

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

+ W.P.(C) 5156/2025

DEVENDER BANSAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vineet Jain, Adv. with Mr.
Davender Bansal, petitioner in person

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Lalit Gupta and Ms. Priyansha
Jain, Advs. for R-6
Mr. Kapil Dutta, Adv. for MCD
(Through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

21.08.2025

1. The present writ petition has been filed for restraining respondent nos. 2 to 5 from carrying out any unauthorized construction in property bearing No. 4227, Chhatta Gosain, Jogiware, Nai Sarak, Chandni Chowk, Delhi-110006, i.e., Dharmarth Property, used as a Dharamshala.
2. This Court notes that when the matter was listed for hearing on 01st August, 2025, Mr. Lalit Gupta, Advocate had appeared for Ms. Chhaya Jain, and stated that said Ms. Chhaya Jain had already purchased the property in question.
3. Thus, *vide* order dated 01st August, 2025, Ms. Chhaya Jain was impleaded as respondent no.6.



4. Today, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1-Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“MCD”) submits that unauthorized construction existing in the property in question was booked by way of issuance of a Show Cause Notice dated 23rd April, 2025. He further submits that after following the due process of law, a Demolition Order dated 04th August, 2025 has been passed.
5. He further submits that in terms of a judgment passed by the Supreme Court, 15 days’ time has been granted to the owner/occupier of the property in question to remove the unauthorized construction and the said period of 15 days, counted from 06th August, 2025, will expire tomorrow, i.e., 22nd August, 2025.
6. Learned counsel appearing for the MCD submits that the MCD shall inspect the property in question and in case, the unauthorized construction has not been removed, requisite action shall be taken by the MCD, in accordance with law.
7. Responding to the aforesaid, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.6 submits that a writ petition has already been filed on behalf of respondent no.6 for stay of the aforesaid Demolition Order, in view of the fact that, at present, there is no Presiding Officer in the Appellate Tribunal, MCD (“ATMCD”).
8. The aforesaid statement made on behalf of the learned counsel for respondent no. 6 is taken note of.
9. This Court further notes the submission that respondent nos. 2 to 5 have no concern with the property in question, as the same has already been purchased by respondent no. 6.
10. Accordingly, it is directed that the MCD shall take requisite action



against the unauthorized construction existing in the property in question, subject to any further orders that may be passed in any further proceedings by this Court or by the ATMCD.

11. It is clarified that all the rights and contentions of the parties are left open, to be decided in appropriate proceedings.

12. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition is disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

AUGUST 21, 2025/KR