



\$~81

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4330/2026 & CM APPL. 21093/2026**

DHARAMVIR SINGH MATHUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vinod Dahiya, Mr. Kuldeep Antil, Mr. Ankit Malik, Ms. Shreya Garg, Mr. Dhruv Khurana, Mr. Bhaskar Dongwal and Ms. Shivangi Sarswat, Advocates.

versus

DEPARTMENT OF IRRIGATION FLOOD CONTROL, DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shashi Pratap Singh, Ms. Shagun Sabharwal and Ms. Anamika Tyagi, Advocates with Mr. Parveen Sharma, JE, CD IX, (I&FC Department, GNCTD).
Mr. Puneet Yadav, Advocate for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

02.04.2026

%

1. The Petitioner claims to be the owner and co-sharer of land admeasuring 40 Biswas (approximately 2000 sq. yards), comprised in Khasra Nos. 988 (0-16), 989 (0-12), 990 (0-05) and 987/2 (0-07), situated in the revenue estate of Village Karala, Outer North District, Delhi. In this regard, reliance is placed on the revenue records annexed with the petition in support of the said claim.

2. It is the Petitioner's case that, despite being in settled possession of the aforesaid land, the Department of Irrigation and Flood Control, Delhi



(Respondent No. 1) is carrying out digging and construction of a drain over the said land. In this backdrop, the Petitioner seeks a direction to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to undertake proper demarcation of the subject land through competent revenue authorities, so as to ascertain the correct boundary between the village *firni* and the Petitioner's private land. The Petitioner further seeks directions for restoration of the damaged gate and for grant of compensation on account of the excavation carried out by officials of Respondent No. 1.

3. The Respondents, on the other hand, dispute the Petitioner's allegations. It is stated that a demarcation exercise was conducted on 23rd February, 2026, pursuant to which certain instances of illegal construction were noticed. According to the Respondents, as per the demarcation report, no digging or construction activity is presently being undertaken on the subject land.

4. From the rival submissions, it emerges that the present controversy essentially pertains to a boundary dispute arising out of the demarcation exercise. The Petitioner disputes the demarcation report and asserts that excavation is being carried out on his land. However, such a dispute, being purely factual in nature, cannot be adjudicated in writ proceedings on the basis of affidavits alone. The Petitioner would be at liberty to avail appropriate remedies, in accordance with law before the competent forum.

5. At this juncture, counsel for the Petitioner submits that a copy of the demarcation report has not been furnished to him despite representation. The Respondents are accordingly directed to supply a copy of the demarcation report to the Petitioner within a period of one week from today.

6. With the above direction, the present petition is disposed of.



7. Pending application also stands disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

APRIL 2, 2026

as