



\$~6

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

%

Date of Decision: 12th February, 2025

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1495/2024
RAJIV SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: None.
versus

THE COMMISSIONER MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI
AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Shweta Singh,
Advocates.
Mr. Sharique Hussain, Advocate for
R-6.
Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

JUDGMENT (oral)

1. On the last date when this petition was taken up, in order to ensure that the process of law was not being misused, this Court had directed the petitioner to file an affidavit with respect to certain relevant aspects.
2. Such direction has not been complied with, as no affidavit has been filed by the petitioner.
3. None appears from the side of the petitioner either.
4. Learned counsel for respondent/MCD however, submits that they have already taken requisite action in the matter and the property in question is lying sealed and some RCC roof panels have also been demolished and the



reinforcement was cut with the help of gas-cutter.

5. It is also submitted that further action is slated for 27th instant which depends on the availability of police force.

6. Status report has already been filed in this regard which is, however, still not on record. However, during course of arguments, hard copy of the same was shared, which the Court has perused.

7. In view of the above, no further action seems required in the present contempt petition.

8. Keeping in mind the above, and the fact that no affidavit has been filed by the petitioner, it becomes obvious that the petitioner is no longer interested in pursuing with the present contempt petition.

9. The contempt petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 12, 2025/ss