



\$~73 and 78

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3398/2026, CM APPL. 16325/2026 & CM APPL. 16326/2026**

SHAHNAZ

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Divyesh Pratap Singh, Mr. Bharat Mishra, Mr. Amit Sangwan & Ms. Prashantipriya Tiwari, Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Senior Advocate with Mr. Siddhant Nath, Standing Counsel for MCD with Mr. Amaan Khan, Mr. Bhavishya Makhija & Mr. Govind, Advocates for MCD.
Mr. Manoj, EE MCD.

78

+ **W.P.(C) 3412/2026, CM APPL. 16384/2026 & CM APPL. 16385/2026**

JARINA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Divyesh Pratap Singh, Mr. Bharat Mishra, Mr. Amit Sangwan & Ms. Prashantipriya Tiwari, Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Senior Advocate with Mr. Siddhant Nath, Standing Counsel for MCD with Mr. Amaan Khan, Mr. Bhavishya Makhija & Mr. Govind, Advocates for MCD.
Mr. Manoj, EE MCD.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER
17.03.2026

%

1. The present writ petitions have been filed, pursuant to the liberty granted by this Court *vide* order dated 11th March 2026, while disposing of the earlier writ petitions, being W.P.(C) 3020/2026 and W.P.(C) 3021/2026, filed by the petitioners. Paragraphs no.3 and 4 of the said order are set out below:

“3. The averments in the petitions are also vague as to whether the properties of the petitioners are encroaching upon the public drain.

4. Accordingly, counsel for the petitioners seeks to withdraw the present writ petitions with liberty to file proper petitions with better particulars within one (1) week from today.”

2. The present writ petitions have been filed expressing an apprehension that the respondent/MCD seeks to demolish the properties of the petitioners, without following the due process of law, more particularly the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Directions in the Matter of Demolition of Structures, In re***, (2025) 5 SCC 1.

3. It is stated in Ground ‘C’ of the petitions that the petitioners have not received any formal show cause notice regarding their residential house being illegally structured.

4. Mr. Poddar, senior counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent/MCD, submits that MCD shall not take action against any unauthorised construction without the issuance of a show cause notice to the petitioner. He further submits that any action taken by the respondent/MCD shall be in accordance with the judgment of the Supreme Court in



Directions in the Matter of Demolition of Structures, In re, (2025) 5 SCC

1.

5. The aforesaid statements are taken on record.

6. In view of the aforesaid statements, the present petition, along with all pending application(s), stands disposed of.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MARCH 17, 2026

at