



\$~84

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

CM APPL. 16623/2026

IN

+ W.P.(C) 2499/2024

SHRI ARUN GUPTA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. K.K. Verma & Mr. Anuj
Kapoor, Advocates.

versus

THE COMMISSIONER MCD & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Pulak Gupta Joshi, Advocate for
MCD.

Ms. Avni Singh, Panel Counsel for
GNCTD with Mr. Vaibhav Sharma,
Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

% **18.03.2026**

CM APPL. 16623/2026 (seeking modification)

1. The present application has been filed by the petitioners seeking modification of the order passed by this Court on 9th March, 2026.
2. The petition was disposed of *vide* order dated 9th March, 2026, while recording that grievances as articulated in prayer clauses 'a' and 'b' had been satisfied.
3. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that prayer clause 'c' in the present writ petition remains undecided and therefore, the writ petition should be re-opened so as to so that a decision in respect of

W.P.(C) 2499/2024

Page 1 of 2



prayer clause 'c' can be given by the Court.

4. For the sake of convenience, prayer clause 'c' of the present writ petition is set out below:

“To decide the question of law with regard to contrary actions of the Respondent No.1 with regard to seal of property by put on lock on property on account of default of payment of Property tax.”

5. In my considered view, the main grievance raised in the present writ petition is covered under prayer clauses 'a' and 'b', which already stand redressed.

5.1. Since the prayer clauses 'a' and 'b' have been redressed, keeping the writ petition pending only for deciding prayer clause 'c' would be an academic exercise. Therefore, no ground for modification of the order dated 9th March, 2026 is made out.

6. Needless to state that the issue raised in prayer clause 'c' would remain open to be decided in an appropriate case.

7. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MARCH 18, 2026

at