



\$~98

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

+ W.P.(C) 15403/2025, CM APPL. 63093/2025 & CM APPL.
63094/2025

MANINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vimal Raj, Advocate
(M:8766213832)

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh, CGSC with Mr.
Adhiraj Singh, Mr. Aryan Dhaka,
Advocates (M:9971359512)
Mr. Tarveen Singh Nanda, Standing
Counsel with Mr. Ankur Mishra,
Advocate for R-2 (M:9999648869)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

08.10.2025

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to respondent nos. 1 to 5, to take appropriate legal action with respect to the unauthorized construction in 1894 properties situated in *Delhi Cantonment, New Delhi-110010*.
2. It is submitted that the petitioner was earlier residing at property bearing no. V-15, Village Old Nangal, Delhi Cantt, New Delhi-110010, which is an ancestral property, presently in the name of the petitioner's father.
3. It is submitted that recently an order dated 27th August, 2025, has been issued by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief Western



Command, Chandimandir, which is the appellate authority in *Appeal No. 04/2024*, thereby, rejecting the appeal of the petitioner with respect to the property in question.

4. Thus, the present writ petition has been filed seeking directions that action ought to be taken by the respondents against the other properties also where the unauthorized construction exists and that the respondents cannot follow a pick and choose policy.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent no. 2- Delhi Cantonment Board, appearing on advance notice, draws the attention of this Court to the order dated 27th August, 2025 passed by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, to submit that the property in question, upon which the petitioner has laid claim, is a public property. He submits that the petitioner herein was not able to show any ownership documents with respect to the said property. Thus, the petitioner herein was considered as an illegal occupier of the premises in question, without any rights existing therein.

6. He further submits that the petitioner has not even challenged the aforesaid order.

7. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, it is directed that in case the petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 27th August, 2025 as aforenoted, the petitioner has the remedy to challenge the same.

8. As regards the other prayer of the petitioner with regard to taking action against other properties, wherein, unauthorized construction exists, it is for the Delhi Cantonment Board to take requisite action, after following the due procedure and in accordance with law.

9. Accordingly, no orders are required to be passed in the present petition.



10. The present petition, along with pending applications, is accordingly disposed of.

OCTOBER 8, 2025/au

MINI PUSHKARNA, J