



\$~50

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4732/2026 & CM APPL. 23120/2026**

PAWAN SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Yadav, Senior Advocate
with Mr. V.P. Rana, Mr. Aviral Jain,
Ms. Bhawna, Mr. Bhuvam Tomar &
Mr. Rohit Mathur, Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIRespondent

Through: Counsel for MCD (*appearance not
given*)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

%

13.04.2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

- a. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other order, writ or direction thereby directing Respondent to consider and decide the regularization application bearing diary no. 3390 dated 02.04.2026, with respect to the property admeasuring about 240 sq.yds. bearing address H.No. WZ-39 B, Village Dasghara, New Delhi- 110012; and/or
- b. It is further prayed that till such time the regularization application bearing diary No. 3390 dated 02.04.2026 is decided, the respondent/ MCD be directed not to take any coercive action with respect to the property admeasuring about 240 sq.yds. bearing address H.No. WZ-39 B, Village Dasghara, New Delhi- 110012; and/or



2. After filing of the present writ petition, the regularization application filed by the petitioner has been rejected by the respondent/ MCD on 8th April, 2026. The extracts from the rejection letter are set out below:

To

Shri Pawan Singh S/O late Shri Ramphal,
R/o WZ-39B, Khasra No. 545, Village Dasghara,
New Delhi 110012

Subject: Application for regularization of existing building in respect of Plot No. WZ-39B, situated in Khasra No. 545, Village Dasghara, New Delhi

Please refer to your application dated 02/04/2026, on the subject cited above. In this regard, it is to inform that mere submission of an application is not sufficient to grant/ extend legitimate status of regularization to the existing construction, which in itself is in gross violation of the prevailing laws/ bye laws (constructed up to fifth floor). Hence, on this obvious ground appropriate proceeding U/s 343/344 & 345-A of DMC Act has already been recorded and needn't requires elaboration.

In view of above, it is therefore, suggested to bring the existing construction within the ambit of prevailing laws/Bye Laws at first and thereafter file a proposal for regularization through a Municipal empanelled Architect, as per laid down procedure. As such, the present proposal is in contravention of the prevailing laws/ bye laws and the same is hereby rejected out rightly.

3. In response to the aforesaid rejection letter, the petitioner has sent a communication dated 10th April, 2026 to the respondent/ MCD stating that the petitioner shall file an application through a Municipal empanelled Architect within fifteen (15) days from today.

4. In view thereof, the present writ petition is disposed of, while giving liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh regularization application through a Municipal empanelled Architect, within seven (7) days from today.

5. The respondent/ MCD shall decide the said regularization application



in accordance with the applicable building bye-laws.

6. Till the time the said application is decided, no coercive steps shall be taken by the respondent/ MCD against the property of the petitioner.

7. In the event the petitioner does not file the regularization application in the prescribed format within seven (7) days from today, the respondent/ MCD shall be permitted to proceed with the demolition action.

8. Needless to state that in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by any order passed by the respondent/MCD, the petitioner is at liberty to seek remedies in accordance with law.

9. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT BANSAL, J

APRIL 13, 2026

at