



\$~67

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

+ W.P.(C) 11990/2025

AJAY GARG

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Yasharth Shukla, Mr. Naman Shukla, Mr. Taha Yasir, Mr. Rajiv Kishore Dubey and Mr. Mukul Kharyal, Advs.

versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anurag Ojha, SSC with Mr. Dipak Ray, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

27.08.2025

%

CM APPL. 53670/2025-For direction

1. The present application is listed on an urgent mentioning since the petitioner has received a Notice dated 25.08.2025 issued by the respondent for eviction of the petitioner from the subject premises to the Commissioner of Police yesterday late evening i.e., 26.08.2025.
2. The facts leading to filing of the present application are such that even though the petition was disposed of *vide* order dated 08.08.2025 with specific directions to the petitioner to approach the concerned appellate authority within a period of *two weeks*, however, a fresh eviction notice dated 25.08.2025 was subsequently issued by the respondent.
3. This is even though the petitioner has already filed an appeal under *Section 9* of the Public Premises Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants Act,



1971 (**PP Act**) has been filed before the Saket Courts (South East), New Delhi on 23.08.2025, which is *one day* later *qua* the *two weeks* granted *vide* order dated 08.08.2025 due to paucity of time. However, the same has not been taken up for hearing as learned counsel for the petitioner has been unable to enter the premises of the learned Saket District Courts, New Delhi due to the ongoing strike by the lawyers.

4. Since the respondent was to take appropriate actions *qua* forcible eviction on 27.08.2025 at 11:30AM of the subject premises wherein the petitioner is situated, the petitioner has filed the present application.

5. Considering that the petitioner has already filed the appeal under *Section 9* of the PP Act, which, due to the ongoing lawyer's strike before the learned Saket District Courts, New Delhi, cannot be attended to and therefore no proactive steps for removing the objections, if any, can be taken for getting it listed before the appropriate Court within the learned Saket District Courts, New Delhi, it will be appropriate if the respondent is directed to intimate the petitioner in writing by giving him at least 72 *hours* (3 *days*) advance notice of any fresh action(s)/ step(s) it chooses to initiate against him and *qua* the subject premises. However, the aforesaid direction shall remain operative till the time the lawyer's strike persists before the learned Saket District Courts, New Delhi.

6. Accordingly, the present application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

AUGUST 27, 2025/Ab