



\$~115

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

+ W.P.(C) 1453/2026

RESIDENTS WELFARE ASSOCIATION VILLAGE RANGPURI
(REGD.).

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pramod Kumar, Adv.

versus

DELHI METRO RAIL CORPORATION LTD. AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Advocate for R-4
to 6.

Mr. Aayush Sharma, Law Officer,
DMRC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

02.02.2026

1. The petitioner wants the name of 'Mahipalpur Metro Station' to be substituted with 'Rangpuri Metro Station' along the Aeorocity to Tughlakabad corridor of MRTS Phase-IV, South Delhi.
2. According to the petitioner, it has requested respondent no. 1 to change the proposed name on various occasions. It is submitted that the Mahipalpur Metro station is situated on land of village-Rangpuri, therefore, as per extant policy, the metro station has to be named as 'Rangpuri Metro Station'. It is submitted that as per letter dated 23.09.2024, of the respondent no. 1, the appropriate authority to take the decision is the Govt. of NCT of Delhi. Representations were also made before the Government of Delhi and even to the Chief Minister of Delhi. However, no action has been taken in this regard. It is further stated that there have been various instances in past



when the metro stations have been named after their village.

3. The Court, however, finds that the nature of relief which is sought by the petitioner clearly falls within the realm of administrative directions and outside the Court's jurisdiction. The Court normally should exercise restraint and avoid stepping into the policy or administrative domain unless the same is found to be completely arbitrary or in violation of the Constitutional provisions. Reference may be made to the decision of the Supreme Court in *Ekta Shakti Foundation v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi*.¹ The Court cannot direct the change of name of the metro station, however, if the petitioner has raised the grievance on the basis of some earlier practices, or purported policy decision, the same will have to be taken to its logical conclusion by the respondents.

4. Under these circumstances, the respondents are directed to consider the petitioner's application within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order passed today.

5. If the respondents are of the opinion that some other government department is to be consulted, they shall consult the said department and shall pass an appropriate order.

6. Petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J
FEBRUARY 2, 2026/P/AMG

¹ (2006) 10 SCC 337