$~21

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

\+ W.P.(C) 4462/2016 & CM APPL. 18640/2016

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Katyal and Mr. S.S. Katyal, Advs. with Manager in person

versus

NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION & ORS. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mohit Batra, Adv. for R-4 (Through VC)
Ms. Madhu Tewatia, Adv. (Through VC)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

O R D E R

% **08.09.2025**

1. The present petition has been filed challenging the order dated 09th February, 2016 passed by the Municipal Taxation Tribunal, Delhi, in Appeal bearing *No. 16/MTT/2016* and *28 to 37/MTT/2016*.

2. This Court notes that *vide* order dated 05th November, 2024, it has been noted as follows:

> *"1. The present writ petition concerns the demand of property tax for the period 2004-05 to 2014-15.*
>
> *2. During the pendency of the petition, the petitioner-Punjab National Bank has handed over possession of the property to the owner of the property, respondent No.4.*
>
> *3. Respondent No.4 has sought to avail of the Amnesty Scheme of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi ["MCD"] and made payment of certain amounts. However, according to MCD, the amount deposited is not*

correct.

4. Notice was, therefore, issued to respondent No.4 by order dated 19.09.2023, and the appearance of learned counsel for the respondent No.4 also been noted in the order dated 08.07.2024. Respondent No.4 is, however, unrepresented today.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner is requested to forward a copy of this order to learned counsel for the respondent No. 4, who is directed to ensure that the counter affidavit of respondent No. 4 is filed within a period of four weeks from today positively. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

6. List on 27.02.2025."

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner reiterates that the petitioner has already vacated the premises in question and peaceful possession of the same has already been handed over to respondent no.4, who is owner of the property in question.

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no.4 submits that the respondent no.4 has already paid full property tax under the Amnesty Scheme.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the MCD submits that though the property tax has been deposited under the Amnesty Scheme, however, the said amount as deposited by respondent no.4 is not correct.

6. If that be the case, the pending issue is a matter between the MCD and respondent no.4.

7. Accordingly, no further orders are required to be passed in the present writ petition.

8. The present writ petition along with the pending application, stands disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

SEPTEMBER 8, 2025/KR