



\$~64

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1557/2026**

PAARDARSHITA PUBLIC WELFARE FOUNDATION (NGO)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Harkrishan Das Nijhawan,
Petitioner in person.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Standing
Counsel, DDA with Mr. Bir Inder
Singh, Mr. Aditya Verma and Mr.
Aryma Sharma, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Digvijay Rai, S.C. with Mr.
Archit Mishra, AAI.
Mr. Manu Chaturvedi, S.C. with Mr.
Ahmed Jamal Siddiqui, Mr. Kshitiz
Kishor Rai, Mr. Madhav Tripathi,
Advs for MCD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

%

04.02.2026

1. The present Petition has been filed in the nature of Public Interest
Litigation seeking the following prayers:

“(A) Issue a writ of mandamus or other appropriate writ(s)/order(s)/direction(s) to Respondent No. 1, the Chief of Special Task Force (STF) and Vice Chairman of Delhi Development Authority, directing them to: 1. Provide details of actions taken on the petitioner's complaint. Dt. 25-11- 2024 2. Comply with the Office Memorandum of Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs No. O-



33011/1/2006-DD-I dated 23-05-2018. 3. Take action against GRID officers of MCD Karol Bagh Zone for allowing unauthorized construction in GRID, despite being in-charge. Needless to say that the unauthorized construction involves exceeding permissible dwelling units (flats) contrary to sanctioned building plans for properties on East Park Road, Karol Bagh Zone, under MCD jurisdiction.”

(B) This Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ(s)/order(s)/direction(s) to Respondent No. 1, directing them to: 1. Lodge a complaint under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, against the GRID Officers of MCD Karol Bagh Zone, responsible for permitting unauthorized construction in excess of sanctioned dwelling units (flats) in GRID. 2. Hold the said officers accountable for their role in allowing such illegal/unauthorized construction. 3. Take necessary action in accordance with Ministry of Housing & Urban Affairs Office Memorandum No. O-33011/1/2006- DD-I dated 23-05-2018, and in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 24-04-2018 in *M. C. Mehta Vs UOI & Ors.*, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 4677 of 1985.”

(C) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ(s) or order(s) or direction(s) to Respondent No. 1 the Chief of Special Task Force (STF) The Vice Chairman, of Delhi Development Authority to take action on the complaint Dt. 25-11-2024 given to the STF Chief against the properties of East Park Road of Karol Bagh Zone where illegal and unauthorised construction of more than the dwelling units (Flats) were constructed against the dwelling units (Flats) permissible and sanctioned by the MCD which is in contradiction and against the rules, regulations, Bye Law, Building Bye Law 2016, Master Plan of Delhi 2021

(D) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ(s) or order(s) or direction(s) to Respondent No. 2 the Commissioner MCD, to take action on the complaint Dt. 15- 08-2025 & Dt. 03-09-2025 given to the Commissioner MCD against the properties of East Park Road of Karol Bagh Zone where illegal and unauthorised construction of more than the dwelling units (Flats) were constructed against the dwelling units (Flats) permissible and sanctioned by the MCD which is in contradiction and against the rules, regulations, Bye Law, Building Bye Law 2016, Master Plan of Delhi 2021



(E) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ(s) or order(s) or direction(s) to Respondent No. 2 to take demolition, sealing, revocation of sanction plan against the properties & action against the owners for not compliance of the undertaking, Affidavit given by them while getting the building plan sanctioned. and or may Pass such other and further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and Circumstances of the case and in the interest of Justice."

2. The Petitioner had filed W.P.(C) 16115/2024 seeking identical relief as sought in the present Petition. The said petition was disposed of *vide* order dated 21.11.2024 while giving liberty to the Petitioner to approach the Special Task Force ("STF") of Delhi Development Authority ("DDA"), Respondent No. 1 herein, by filing individual complaints against specific properties and the rights and contentions of all the parties were left open.

3. It is the case of the Petitioner that pursuant to the said order dated 14.11.2024, the Petitioner filed a complaint before the STF on 25.11.2024 providing the details of 11 properties and requesting the STF to take action of demolition / sealing against the said properties in a time bound manner.

4. As no action was taken by the STF on the complaint dated 25.11.2024 filed by the Petitioner, the Petitioner filed an RTI application to seek the Action Taken Report by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD") on the complaint dated 25.11.2024 filed by the Petitioner. On 29.04.2025, the Petitioner received a reply to the RTI application stating that the status of STF complaints are available on public portal and the Petitioner may obtain status of the complaint filed by it through the portal.

5. The Petitioner filed an appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 19.05.2025 against the reply dated 29.04.2025. *Vide* order dated 04.06.2025, the First Appellate Authority directed the MCD to provide information



within 10 days. On 25.07.2025, the Petitioner received a reply from the MCD, however, the information as directed *vide* order of the First Appellate Authority was not provided and it was stated therein that the Petitioner did not comply with the direction of this Court passed *vide* order dated 21.11.2024 and submitted the complaint involving numerous properties into a single complaint. Accordingly, the Petitioner was advised to file individual complaints as directed by this Court *vide* order dated 21.11.2024 in W.P.(C) 16115/2024.

6. Being aggrieved by the reply dated 25.07.2025, the Petitioner has filed the present Petition seeking the directions as stated above.

7. We have heard the Petitioner in person, Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, the learned Standing Counsel on behalf of the STF / DDA and Mr. Manu Chaturvedi, the learned Standing Counsel on behalf of MCD.

8. The Petitioner has contended that despite complying with the order dated 21.11.2024 in W.P.(C) 16115/2024 and filing the complaint before the STF on 25.11.2024, for more than 14 months no action has been taken pursuant to the complaint made by the Petitioner.

9. The Petitioner has also contended that after receiving the reply dated 25.07.2025, the Petitioner has filed individual complaints before the MCD. However, no action has been taken by either the STF or the MCD.

10. The learned Counsel for the MCD submits that out of the 11 properties mentioned by the Petitioner in its complaint, action has already been taken against 3 properties.

11. The learned Counsel for the STF / DDA submits that the complaint dated 25.11.2024 filed before the STF was not in consonance with the directions as contained in the order dated 21.11.2024 as the said complaint



contained a list of 11 properties, whereas the order dated 21.11.2024 directed the Petitioner to approach the STF by filing individual complaints against specific properties. It was also pointed out that the individual complaints stated to have been filed by the Petitioner were addressed to the MCD and not STF. Accordingly, the said complaints were also not in accordance with the order dated 21.11.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 16115/2024. It was further submitted by the learned Counsel for the STF / DDA on instructions that if the Petitioner were to file individual complaints against specific properties, the STF shall take appropriate action in accordance with law.

12. In view of the above submissions on behalf of the STF / DDA and the MCD, the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner will approach the STF by filing individual complaints against specific properties in terms of the order dated 21.11.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 16115/2024.

13. Accordingly, if the Petitioner files such individual complaints, it is expected that the STF will take appropriate action in terms of the statement made above as expeditiously as possible.

14. The present Petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

FEBRUARY 4, 2026

ap