



\$~76

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

+ W.P.(C) 11560/2025 & CM APPL. 47231/2025

HARJINDER KAUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. M.S. Bammi, Ms. Bhawna, Ms.
Meenakshi Tyagi, Advocates
(M:9891911118)

versus

THE COMMISSIONER MCD OF DELHI & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Saroj Bidawat, Standing counsel-
MCD

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

13.10.2025

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to respondent nos. 1 to 3, i.e., Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD") to consider the regularization application of the petitioner *qua* the property bearing *Flat No. 298, Mandakini Enclave, Alaknanda, New Delhi- 110019*, without requiring a No Objection Certificate of owners of other flats in vertical stack.
2. Today, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the regularization application of the petitioner, has been rejected *vide* order dated 09th October, 2025, which was received by the petitioner on 10th October, 2025, through a WhatsApp message.
3. He submits that the petitioner is yet to receive the physical copy of the said Rejection Order.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the application



for regularization has been rejected, he shall file an appeal before the Appellate Tribunal MCD (“ATMCD”), which has resumed its working from today, i.e., 13th October, 2025, since a new Presiding Officer has taken charge from today.

5. He further submits that the petitioner may be granted limited protection of two weeks in order to allow the petitioner to file the requisite appeal before the ATMCD.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the MCD submits that the application for regularization, filed on behalf of the petitioner, has been rejected properly as per law, after considering the facts and circumstances of the present case.

7. She further submits that a physical copy of the said Rejection Order has already been communicated to the petitioner.

8. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, since regularization application of the petitioner has already been rejected, the petitioner would have to seek his remedies by filing a statutory appeal, before the ATMCD.

9. Accordingly, considering the prayer made before this Court, it is directed that in order to allow the petitioner to file an appeal before the ATMCD, no coercive action for demolition or sealing shall be taken against the property of the petitioner for a period of two weeks.

10. However, it is clarified that, in case, the petitioner does not file an appeal before the ATMCD, within a period of two weeks from today, the protection granted by this Court by today’s order, shall automatically lapse.

11. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case, which shall be considered by the ATMCD.

12. Rights and contentions of the parties are left open.



13. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition, along with pending application, is disposed of.

14. *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

OCTOBER 13, 2025/au