



\$~43

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5558/2026 with CM APPL. 27120/2026**

NITIN SARNA

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner present through VC.

versus

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Astha Gupta, Advocate for
GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

%

24.04.2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondent to pay a sum of Rs. 1,43,44,500/-, towards compensation for mental agony caused to the petitioner on account of scrapping of his vehicle.
2. For the ease of convenience, the prayers made in the present writ petition are set out below:

a) Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction, directing the Respondent to pay me a sum of Rs. 14,344,500/- (Rupees One Crore, Forty-Three Lakhs, Forty-Four Thousand, and Five Hundred Only), net of all applicable taxes, as compensation for the mental agony, prolonged effort, and harassment due to the unjust seizure, detention, and scrapping of my vehicle;

b) Award me the costs of the present and previous proceedings;

3. The petitioner, who appears in-person, was aggrieved with the illegal scrapping of his motor cycle. The motor cycle was seized on 2nd December,



2024 from outside his residence. The petitioner was handed over a seizure memo in terms of which the vehicle was an end-of-life vehicle, having completed 15 years of life.

4. It is stated that the petitioner sent various notices to the respondent, protesting against the seizure.

5. Since no response was forthcoming, the petitioner filed a writ petition before this Court being W.P. (C) 681/2026, demanding release of the vehicle along with compensation of Rs. 5,85,000/-. At the hearing on 28th March, 2026, it was informed by counsel for the respondent that the subject vehicle had already been scrapped. Accordingly, the said writ petition was disposed of, while giving liberty to the petitioner to initiate appropriate proceedings to seek compensation.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition has been filed seeking compensation of Rs.1,43,44,500/-.

7. Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent, on advance notice, submits that admittedly, the vehicle of the petitioner was an end-of-life vehicle, having served for 15 years. He further submits that the vehicle was parked outside the residence of the petitioner on a public street and was therefore validly seized by the respondent. The vehicle was scrapped in accordance with the Registration and Functions of Vehicle Scrapping Facility Rules, 2021 ('RVSF') as the petitioner failed to file the requisite undertaking within three (3) weeks.

8. Having heard counsel for the parties, in the opinion of this Court, the present writ petition raises disputed questions of fact and whether the petitioner is entitled to any compensation. The quantum of loss would have to be proved by leading evidence, which exercise cannot be undertaken in



the present writ petition.

9. The earlier writ petition was disposed of giving liberty to the petitioner to initiate appropriate proceedings in law to seek compensation.

10. Clearly, the appropriate proceedings for seeking compensation would have been a civil suit and not a writ petition.

11. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.

AMIT BANSAL, J

APRIL 24, 2026

at