



\$~46

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

+ LPA 89/2026 & CM Nos.12593/2026 & 12594/2026

NSMC

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Nishant Kaushik and Mr. Farid
Abbas, Advs.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Namrata Mukim, S.C. for R-1
Ms. Shahana Farah, ASC with Mr.
Abhigyan, Ms. Reya Paul, Advs. for
R-2
Mr. Lohit Ganguly and Mr. Ajay
Kumar, Advs. for R-3

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **24.02.2026**

1. Heard learned Counsel representing the parties.
2. This intra-court appeal challenges an order dated 02.02.2026 passed by learned Single Judge whereby while allowing the application seeking impleadment filed by the appellant, a direction has been issued to the Municipal Corporation of Delhi to carry out the demolition on public land within 04 weeks.
3. The DCP of the area concerned has also been directed to provide adequate police assistance including female police officers and ensure



compliance.

4. It has been argued by learned counsel for the appellant that on one hand by the impugned order, the learned Single Judge has allowed the impleadment of the appellant and on the other hand, without permitting the appellant to put forth its case, has issued a direction for demolition of the alleged illegal structure on the public land and as such, such an order is not sustainable and was passed without affording an opportunity of hearing to the appellant.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, what we find is that the writ petition was filed before the learned Single Judge seeking a direction for demolition of certain alleged illegal construction on the public land. The appellant is said to be a Committee known as Narela Shiv Mandir Committee, however, when we enquired from the learned counsel for the appellant, whether it is a registered society, he stated that it is not a registered society but has been formed by the local residents to do *Pooja Archana* etc. in the local Shiv Mandir.

6. Learned Single Judge while allowing the impleadment application by the impugned order dated 02.02.2026 has noted in paragraph 7 of the said order that the appellant who was the applicant before the learned Single Judge in the impleadment application, had admitted that, the structure is unauthorized.

7. In the wake of the said admission made on behalf of the appellant, the submission on behalf of the learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant was not heard before the order of demolition was passed, is not sustainable.

8. We do not find any good ground to entertain this appeal for the



aforesaid grievance.

9. Accordingly, the present appeal along with pending applications stands dismissed.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

FEBRUARY 24, 2026/j