



\$~98

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 557/2026**

SHABNAM KHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Srivastava, Ms. Uzma,
Advs.

versus

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

Through: Mr. Mukesh Gupta (Standing
Counsel) along with Ms. Madhu
Yadav, Ms. P Sneha Roy, Ms.
Gurleen Kaur, Advs. R-1/ MCD
Ms. Chand Chopra, Mr. Punishk
Handa, Advs. for R-2/ STF
Mr. Raj Kumar Yadav, Ms. Preeti
Gothwal, Advs. for R3-SHO (Tigri)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

06.04.2026

CM APPL.21807/2026 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 557/2026

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging wilful disobedience/ non-compliance of the directions contained in the order dated 29.10.2025 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.P.(C) 16335/2025. The said order reads as under:-

“1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. This petition seeks a direction to stop and demolish the illegal and unauthorized construction at property bearing no.283, A-Block, 600 Square Yards, Tigri Extension, New Delhi-110062.

3. Learned counsel representing the STF has stated that the complaint made



by the petitioner has been processed and in some cases, the properties have been booked as well.

4. In view of the aforesaid, we dispose of this writ petition with a direction to the respondents to conclude the proceedings drawn on the complaint made by the petitioner and take the same to its logical end. We further direct that the completion of proceedings drawn on the basis of the complaints, if any action is required to be taken, the same shall be concluded with expedition, say within a period of 02 months from today.

5. Learned counsel representing the respondents shall apprise the respective respondents of this order forthwith.

6. The pending applications also stand disposed of.”

4. It is the case of the petitioner that despite repeated complaints/representations in the aftermath of the said order, the requisite action has not been taken by the concerned respondents.

5. Mr. Mukesh Gupta, learned standing counsel for the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD) who appears on advance notice, submits that in fact, requisite action was taken after the aforesaid order dated 29.10.2025 came to be passed. He submits that a demolition order was issued qua the unauthorised construction in the property in question and part demolition action was taken on 06.11.2025.

6. He further submits that the remaining demolition action is scheduled to be taken on 09.04.2026. It is assured and undertaken that the demolition action shall be taken to its logical conclusion on the said date. The said undertaking is taken on record. Let the requisite demolition action be taken in respect of the concerned property in question and a compliance affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks from today.

7. Let the Special Task Force (STF) also carry out an independent inspection of the property in question to ensure compliance with the



aforesaid directions.

8. No further orders are required to be passed in the present petition.

The same is accordingly disposed of.

9. Order *dasti*.

SACHIN DATTA, J

APRIL 6, 2026/uk