



\$~60 & 67

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

**60.**

+ **W.P.(C) 4087/2026 with CM APPL. 20020/2026**

INDUS TOWERS LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber and Mr. Nikunj Arora, Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI  
AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Goyal, Mr. Tanveet Kaur and Ms. Deepa Rathore, Advocates for R-1 to R-3.

**67.**

+ **W.P.(C) 4119/2026 with CM APPL. 20108/2026**

INDUS TOWERS LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Chhibber and Mr. Nikunj Arora, Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI  
AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Goyal, Mr. Tanveet Kaur and Ms. Deepa Rathore, Advocates for R-1 to R-3.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL**

**ORDER**

**30.03.2026**

%

1. The present writ petitions have been filed seeking quashing of the



Show Cause Notices dated 4<sup>th</sup> November, 2025. In terms of the aforesaid Show Cause Notices, the petitioner has been called upon to pay license fee in terms of Section 417 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 (hereinafter 'DMC Act').

2. Mr. Ankur Chhibber, counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not liable to pay any license fee in terms of Section 417 of the DMC Act. Replies to the said Demand Notices have been sent belatedly on 25<sup>th</sup> March, 2026.

3. Clearly, the aforesaid replies are yet to be considered by the respondent/MCD. Therefore, in my opinion, the present writ petitions are premature.

4. In view thereof, the present writ petitions are disposed of, while directing the respondent/MCD to pass a speaking order based on the replies filed on behalf of the petitioner.

5. Needless to state, in the event MCD is of the opinion that the petitioner is liable to pay license fee under Section 417 of the DMC Act, reasonable time would be given to the petitioner to pay.

6. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

**AMIT BANSAL, J**

**MARCH 30, 2026**

Vivek/-