



2026:DHC:1565



\$~104

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**+ **W.P.(C) 2228/2026**Date of Decision: **17.02.2026****SANJAY GUPTA**

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

UNION OF INDIAN AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhananjai Rana, CGSC for R1.
Ms. Avni Singh, Advocate for
GNCTD.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV****J U D G E M E N T****PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)**

The Petitioner is the lawful allottee and occupant of Flat No. 304, F-Block, CGRC, DDU Marg, a residential accommodation owned and maintained by Respondent No.1 Union of India [UOI]. It is the specific case of the Petitioner that, as per the sanctioned and uniform layout of the residential complex, each flat is provided with an attached servant quarter admeasuring approximately 100 sq. ft., comprising a single room with an attached bathroom and balcony. The Petitioner asserts that Indraprastha Gas Limited has installed Piped Natural Gas (PNG) connections in these servant quarters. According to the Petitioner, the provision of PNG connections in such small and confined spaces is inherently unsafe and fraught with serious

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:AMIT KUMAR
SHARMA
Signing Date:21.02.2026
15:51:38

Signature Not Verified

Signed
By:PURUSHAINDR
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:1565



fire hazards, thereby posing a grave and continuing threat to the life and property of the residents.

2. Furthermore, it is contended that the servants' families blocked stair case and lift lobbies, causing obstruction to the common space. The provisions of Section 152 of the *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023* [BNSS] envisaged a mechanism where District Magistrate or a Sub-Divisional Magistrate or any other Executive Magistrate is empowered to pass a conditional order for renewal of nuisance which *inter alia* is injurious to the health or physical comfort of the community.

3. Since the petitioner has not approached the said authority, the Court therefore is unable to comprehensively deal with the controversy unless the petitioner approaches the Judicial Magistrate for redressal of his grievance. Similar view has been taken by this Court in the case of *Sh Nilabh Sharma v. Municipal Corporation of Delhi*¹. The petitioner seems to have made the grievances to the other authorities, however, for redressal of the petitioner's grievance, the concerned Judicial Magistrate would be the appropriate authority to deal with the issue. If the petitioner approaches the concerned Judicial Magistrate, let his application be decided with due expedition in accordance with law.

4. With these observations, the petition stands disposed of. Liberty stands reserved to re-agitate the grievance in case the same is not fully mitigated.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2026

Tr/ap

¹ WP(C) 11400/2024