



\$~25

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 8771/2025, CM APPL. 37474/2025 & CM APPL. 37475/2025**

HARVINDER RANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yadunandan Bansal, Ms. Gulshan Jahan, Mr. Narshinga Rao and Mr. Murshlin Ansari, Advocates along with petitioner.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Kapil Dutta, Mr. Vikas Chopra, Mr. Vansh Luthra, Mr. Dipesh Chopra, Mr. Siddharth Parashar and Mr. Chirag Sharma, Advocates for MCD.
Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC with Mr. Ayush Tanwar and Ms. Ayushi Srivastava, Advocates for R-4/DCP.
Ms. Mrinalini Sen, Standing Counsel with Ms. Aditi Saxena, Advocate for DDA.
SI Suresh Kumar, PS Kapashera.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER
02.07.2025

%

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Kapil Dutta representing the Municipal Corporation of Delhi.
2. This petition purportedly filed in public interest seeks a direction from the Court to the respondents to stop certain alleged, illegal and unauthorized



constructions being raised at properties bearing KH No. 38//19/2, 38//12, 38//2/3, Farm House No. D22 Pushpanjali Farms, Bijwasan, New Delhi-110061.

3. A further direction has been sought for removal of the alleged encroachment and demolition of the alleged, illegal and unauthorized structures.

4. The petitioner has described himself to be a practicing lawyer, however, when we peruse the averments made in the writ petition what we find is that the petition completely lacks specific details as to in what manner the construction being sought to be termed as illegal are unauthorizedly or illegally being raised by certain residents except for making a generalized averment that illegal/unauthorized constructions are being raised, no specific details have been provided as to why the alleged construction, what law or bylaw or any other rule or regulation is being violated.

5. Further we also notice certain averments in the writ petition regarding illegal electricity connection, however, no research or study appears to have been conducted by the petitioner to disclose correct and necessary facts before the Court to adjudicate the issues. The petition therefore appears to be lacking seriousness required for approaching the Court in a public interest litigation petition.

6. Entertaining such petition, ostensibly filed in public interest encourages half-baked petitions and petitions bereft of any specific details and necessary facts being entertained by the Court which in our opinion should not be permitted. It is expected of a public interest litigation petitioner, especially when he is a practicing lawyer, that petition shall be filed with all necessary studies and shall contain complete and necessary details and facts



to enable the Court to adjudicate the issue, in absence whereof entertaining such a petition will be treading into a perilous path.

7. In the aforesaid view of the matter, we are not inclined to entertain this writ petition, which is hereby dismissed.

8. We are also of the opinion that having regard to the nature of petition filed, petitioner should be saddled with some cost, however considering the fact that petitioner is a young lawyer having putting only two years in the profession, we refrain from imposing the cost.

9. The petition is however dismissed.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

JULY 2, 2025

yrj