



\$~8

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

+ W.P.(C) 4599/2026 & CM APPL. 22458/2026

PRAVEEN KUMAR GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: *Appearance not given.*

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, SC with
Mr. Sunil Kumar Jha, Mr. Mohd.
Sueb Akhtar and Ms. Joohu Kumari,
Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Brijesh Yadav, SPC with Ms.
Nikita, Advocates for R-6.
S.I. Pankaj Dhatarwal, P.S. Bawana.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

06.05.2026

1. The Petitioner claims to be the lawful owner to the extent of 25% share in agricultural land situated in village Dariyapur Kalan, Bawana, Delhi forming part of Khasra No. 92/1(6-2), 2(4-17), 9(1-12) situated at village Dariya Pur Kanan, opposite Fire Station, Bawana, Delhi and states that he holds valid title documents in respect of his share in the property. The Petitioner asserts that the said land continues to be recorded as agricultural land and alleges that unauthorized commercial activities are being carried out thereon, including use of the premises for marriage functions, banquet activities and other social events, allegedly in violation of the applicable land use norms and planning regulations.
2. The grievance of the Petitioner is directed, *inter alia*, against the grant



of a No Objection Certificate/permission dated 23rd January, 2023 in favour of certain occupants/users of the property for holding social and marriage functions at the site. According to the Petitioner, such permission could not have been granted in respect of agricultural land and, in any event, could not have been issued without proper verification of ownership and possessory rights.

3. During the course of hearing, it has emerged that there exists an underlying dispute in respect of the subject property. The Petitioner relies upon an arbitral award dated 05th April, 2013 passed by the Sole Arbitrator, whereby certain family properties, including the subject land, are stated to have been partitioned and the Petitioner is stated to have been recognized as holding a 25% share therein. The Petitioner further submits that execution petition being Ex. P. 104/2024 seeking enforcement of the award is presently pending and that the persons stated to be occupying the subject property are interveners in the said proceedings. It is further submitted that directions have also been issued therein to the SHO concerned to provide police protection to the Local Commissioner for facilitating proceedings relating to recovery of physical possession of the property.

4. In view of the aforesaid factual position, this Court is of the considered view in the present proceedings there can be no adjudication in respect of the disputed questions concerning title, possession, entitlement or the legality of occupation of the subject property by the concerned occupants. Those aspects would necessarily fall for consideration in appropriate proceedings, including the pending execution proceedings, in accordance with law.

5. Insofar as the challenge to the allegations pertaining to the impugned



NOC and the misuse of the property are concerned, MCD shall consider the present petition as a representation and, in the event the use of the property is found to be lawful, no further action shall be warranted. However, if the use of the property is found to be in contravention of the provisions of the MCD Act or any other applicable statutory provisions, appropriate action shall be taken in accordance with law. The aforesaid exercise shall be completed within a period of eight weeks.

6. It is clarified that this Court has expressed no opinion on the contention of misuse of the property or on the claims regarding title, possession, or entitlement in respect of the property. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

7. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 6, 2026/hc