



\$~10 to 13

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1268/2025**

HEENA ALEEM

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Varun Deswal, Mr. Danish Khan,
Adv. for Petitioner no. 1 and 2. Along
with petitioner no. 2 in person through
Vc.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nikhil P., Ms. Bhavya Sharma,
Ms. Vaidushya Parth, Adv. for MCD.

11

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1269/2025**

SHAGUFTA FEROZ AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Varun Deswal, Mr. Danish Khan,
Adv. for Petitioner no. 1 and 2. Along
with petitioner no. 2 in person through
Vc.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Gupta, Adv. for MCD.

12

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1270/2025**

SHAGUFTA FEROZ AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Varun Deswal, Mr. Danish Khan,
Adv. for Petitioner no. 1 and 2. Along
with petitioner no. 2 in person through
Vc.



versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Gupta, Adv. for MCD.

13

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1271/2025

SHAGUFTA FERAZ AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Varun Deswal, Mr. Danish Khan,
Adv. for Petitioner no. 1 and 2. Along
with petitioner no. 2 in person through
Vc.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anuj Gupta, Adv. for MCD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

22.09.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petitions have been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the directions contained in order dated 11.07.2025 passed by the learned Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in writ petition Nos. 9627/2025, 9629/2025, 9578/2025, 9893/2025, whereby the following directions were passed: -

“14. Considering the submissions made before this Court, it is directed that the petitioners shall use the subject property as per the use, which is permissible under the Master Plan for Delhi, 2021 and in accordance with law. In case, any permission or license is required for carrying out any activity from the premises in question, the same shall be obtained by the petitioners from the concerned authorities.



15. Accordingly, the petitioners are directed to submit an undertaking with the MCD that they shall use the subject property only in accordance with law, and carry out permitted activities only.

16. Let the said undertaking be filed by the petitioners with the MCD, within a period of two working days from today.

17. Upon the petitioners submitting such an undertaking, and complying with other directions of the MCD in that regard, including, payment of any requisite charges, the MCD is directed to de-seal the subject property of the petitioner within two days of the petitioner carrying out the necessary compliances.

18. Further, the petitioners are held to be bound by their undertaking before this Court that they shall use the subject property only as per the permissible activities, in accordance with law and after taking requisite permissions/licences from the concerned authorities, wherever required.”

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that subsequently, in pursuance of the aforesaid order, an undertaking was given by the petitioners. It is the submission on behalf of the petitioners that the respondent is in complete disobedience of the aforesaid directions and has raised a demand of conversion charges/misused charges of the premises/portions for permanent de-sealing by a communication dated 22.07.2025.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that way back in 2018-19, the petitioners had paid conversion charges and, therefore, the aforesaid demand could not have been raised by the learned counsel for the respondent.

5. This Court is of the considered opinion that while disposing of the writ petitions preferred by the petitioners, the directions by the learned Co-ordinate Bench was to the effect that on undertakings being given and complying with the directions of the MCD, including the payment of any requisite charge, the



latter was directed to de-seal the subject property of the petitioners, provided they carry out all the necessary compliances.

6. MCD has now raised certain charges which are disputed by the petitioners which cannot be determined in the present contempt petitions.

7. In view of the above, the present petitions are disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to initiate appropriate proceedings in accordance with law before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

8. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/kr