



\$~74

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

+ W.P.(C) 15056/2025

SHEEBA MEHFOOZ (THROUGH SPA HOLDER SYED TASEER AHMED)Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gaurav Kumar and Mr. Pawan Kr. Yadav, Advs.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rakesh Malhotra, Adv. for MCD
Ms. Kritika Gupta and Ms. Vidushi Singhania, Advs. for R-4/DDA.
Mr. Sandeep Tyagi, SPC, UOI for R-5.
Mr. Baban, Adv. for R-6 & R-7.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER
26.09.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondent nos. 1 to 4, to take action against the unauthorized construction, being undertaken by respondent nos. 6 and 7 on the *Plot No. 2, Khasra No. 940/534, Pillar No. 202, Near Kalindi Kunj Metro Station, Delhi-25.*
2. Responding to the present writ petition, learned counsel appearing for respondent-Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD"), submits that the property in question already stands booked. He submits that the first partial demolition action was taken on 1st May, 2024, and another partial demolition action has been taken on 8th September, 2025.



3. He further submits that there is no ongoing construction in the property, as of today.

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent nos. 6 and 7, who are the owners/occupants of the property in question, submits that there are several litigations going on between the petitioner and respondent nos. 6 and 7. He, thus, submits that the present writ petition is a motivated writ petition and has been filed to settle personal scores of the petitioner with respondent nos. 6 and 7.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the MCD, it is manifest that the MCD is already taking action against the property in question.

6. Accordingly, the MCD is held bound to take further action against the property in question and remove the unauthorized construction existing therein.

7. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved by any non action on the part of the MCD, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the Special Task Force ("STF"), as constituted by the Supreme Court, in terms of the orders passed by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of *Devender Versus Govt. of NCT of Delhi and Ors.*, in W.P.(C) 1807/2018 and *Fazruddin Versus DDA and Ors.* in W.P.(C) 4649/2017.

8. In case, the respondent nos. 6 and 7, i.e., owners/occupants of the property in question, are aggrieved by any action on behalf of the MCD, they have the liberty to seek their remedies in accordance with law.

9. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 6 and 7 submits that respondent no. 6 and 7 are running a Banquet Hall, after taking a requisite permission from the competent authority. He further submits that the said



Banquet Hall is running for the last 15 years.

10. The aforesaid statement is taken note of.

11. With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/H