



\$~16

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8496/2025 & CM APPL. 36894-36895/2025**

TIRS PAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohit Kr. Sharma, Advocate

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohtagi, Mr. Dhruv Kuma, Ms. Chandrika Sachdev, Mr. Puneet Kr. Tiwari, Advocates for R-1, 2 and 3
Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain (SPC), Mr. Ankush Kapoor, Advocates for R-4/UOI

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **23.06.2025**

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking directions to the Respondents from neither demolishing the part structures and/or dispossessing the Petitioner from plot bearing no.8, measuring 90 Sq. Yds., situated within the extended Lal Dora of Village Maidan Garhi, New Delhi comprised in Khasra No. 11, Khata/Khatoni No. 92/101, 114 of Village Maidan Garhi, New Delhi ('subject property'). It is stated that the said action has been undertaken by the Respondents on the pretext that the subject land falls within ridge/forest land.
2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner contends that the Petitioner is the owner of a subject property by virtue of a sale deed which was registered on



09.05.2025.

2.1. He states that Petitioner after purchasing the subject property constructed a boundary wall and temporary *tin* shed room.

2.2. He states that recently the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 have demolished a part of boundary wall and the temporary *tin* shed room.

3. Issue notice.

4. Learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 accepts notice. He states that Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 disputes that any demolition has been carried out in Khasra No. 11.

4.1. He states that demolition action has been carried out in Khasra no. 688/570 which is a forest land.

4.2. He states that boundary wall constructed by the Petitioner was noticed recently and identified as an encroachment and therefore, appropriate action was taken to secure the Government land. He refers to the order dated 15.01.2025 passed in O.A. 144/2015 by the National Green Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi ('NGT'). He relies upon paragraphs '9', '10' and '11' therein. The relevant paragraph '11' reads as under:

“11. Learned Amicus points out that in respect of areas, which are un-encroached and have already been demarcated and handed over to Forest Department as per stand of the Revenue Secretary as above, final Notification under Section 20 of the Forest Act should be issued forthwith. Such area should be covered by boundary wall/fencing in accordance with Section 6 to 8 of the Forest Act. The Forest Department should prepare Management Plan and the statutory authorities must regularly inspect the area and ensure that it is kept encroachment free. With regard to the remaining, the identified encroached areas should be retrieved in second phase by time bound action plan to be executed and monitored by the authorities for which there should also be high powered oversight Committee. We find merit in the suggestion and we propose to issue directions in



these terms.”

4.3. He states that Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 dispute that private plot No. 8 i.e., the subject property is not a ridge/forest land as alleged by the Petitioner.

4.4. He states that the appropriate remedy if any which the Petitioner has is to approach the concerned SDM i.e. Respondent No. 3 for verification of his claims.

4.5. He states that the Petitioner has failed to place on record any chain of documents proving the title of the vendee from whom the subject property has been placed.

5. In response, learned counsel for the Petitioner states that he will file an appropriate application before the concerned SDM for verification of this claim within one (1) week.

Directions

6. In view of the submission of the parties and the facts noted above, this Court is satisfied that no ground is made out for issuing any restraint order against Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

7. However, Petitioner is at liberty to approach the concerned SDM within a period of one (1) week to seek verification of its claims. The application if filed will be decided by the SDM in accordance with law.

8. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Pending applications also stands disposed of.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 23, 2025/mt/sk