



\$~12

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4735/2026 & CM APPL. 23126/2026**

SUDHIR AGARWALPetitioner

Through: **Ms. Aayushi Jain, Advocate.**

versus

DELHI FIRE SERVICE AND ORSRespondents

Through: **Mr. Shiven Varma and Mr. Rudraksh Mathur, Advocates for R-1.**

Mr. Rajesh Kumar, SPC with Mr. Siddharth Shekhar, Advocate for R-2 & 3.

Ms. Meherunnisa Anand Jaitley, Advocate for R-4/MCD.

SI Dharampal, Pairvi Officer Traffic.

SI Kapil Dev, P.S.: Model Town Circle.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

% **16.04.2026**

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

- a. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing Respondent no.1 to 4 authorities to take immediate action against the illegal and unauthorized construction and commercial activities being carried out by Respondent No.5 i.e. Fiona club & flos music bar situated at model town-iii, delhi ;and
- b. Direct the Respondent No.4/Municipal Corporation of Delhi to inspect the premises and take immediate action against the unauthorized construction and encroachment at the behest of Respondent No.5 i.e. Fiona club & flos music bar situated at model town-iii, delhi ; and



- c. Direct the Respondent No.1/Delhi Fire Service to inspect the premises and take appropriate action in case of non-compliance with fire safety regulations; and
- d. Direct the Respondent No.2/Delhi Traffic Police to remove illegal parking and encroachment on public roads and footpaths; and
- e. Direct closure/sealing of the premises of Respondent No.5 if found operating without valid licenses or statutory clearances; and
- f. Pending disposal of the present petition, this Hon'ble Court may kindly direct the respondent authorities to conduct an immediate inspection of the premises of Respondent No.5 and restrain the illegal activities being carried out therein.

2. Ms. Meherunnisa Anand Jaitley, counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.4/ MCD, submits that all necessary regulatory approvals and permissions, including the fire safety certificate have been granted in favour of the respondent no.5 for running its commercial establishment on the subject property.

2.1 She further points out that the petitioner has no locus to file the present petition as the petitioner resides far away from the subject property.

3. Taking note of the aforesaid submissions, counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present writ petition.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition along with the pending application is dismissed as withdrawn.

AMIT BANSAL, J

APRIL 16, 2026

Rzu