$~58

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

\+ W.P.(C) 11802/2025 & CM APPL. 48199/2025, CM APPL. 48200/2025

JAI SINGH .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akshya and Ms. Nupur, Advs.
Mob: 9891959904
Email: chambersofadv.akshya@gmail.com

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. .....Respondents

Through: Dr. Vijendra Mahndiyan, CGSC with Mr. Chetan Jadon (GP), Mr. Vansh Jadon and Ms. Hemlata Singh, Advs. for R-1 and 3
Mr. Ankur Mishra, Adv. for R-2 (Through VC)
Mr. Sanjay Vashishtha, Mr. Siddhartha Goswami, Ms. Geetanjali Reddy and Mr. Aditya Sachdeva, Advs. for R-4
Email: v/ocommunication@outlook.com
Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC for R-MCD with Ms. Parvin Bansal, Adv.
Mob: 9911991166

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

O R D E R

% **07.08.2025**

1. The present writ petition has been filed against the action of respondent no. 2, i.e., Delhi Cantonment Board ("DCB"), on the ground that

the even though DCB had never taken over the area in *Naraina Extension,* where the plot of the petitioner is located, respondent no. 2 is forcing the petitioner to pay highly inflated and illegal property tax.

2. It is submitted that the petitioner is a senior citizen, who is the owner and in possession of the two plots bearing Nos. *CB-222 and CB-223, measuring 100 square yrds. each* in undivided *Khasra No. 994,* situated in *Naraina Village.*

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further submits that the said two plots of the petitioner were never acquired by the respondents and it is only respondent no. 5, i.e., Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD"), which has the lawful authority to charge the property tax over the plots of the petitioner.

4. *Per contra,* learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 5, i.e., MCD, on advanced notice, upon instructions, submits that the property in question, which is subject matter of the present writ petition, does not fall within the jurisdiction of the MCD, and is under the jurisdiction of the DCB.

5. Similarly, learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2, i.e., DCB submits that the area is under their jurisdiction. He submits that in the garb of the present writ petition, the petitioner is challenging the Assessment Order for payment of property tax.

6. He, thus, submits that the present petition is not maintainable and that the petitioner has an efficacious remedy of filing an appeal before the District Judge, under Section 93 of the Cantonments Act, 2006.

7. At this stage, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that in view of the submission made on behalf of the MCD that the land in question does not fall within the jurisdiction of MCD, and that it is the DCB,

which is the appropriate authority for collecting property tax, *qua* the property in question, he submits that the petitioner shall seeks his remedies, in accordance with law.

8. Accordingly, the present writ petition, along with the pending applications, is dismissed as withdrawn.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

AUGUST 7, 2025/SK