



\$~96

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 5827/2026, CM. APPL. 28657/2026 & CM. APPL. 28658/2026**

BIJENDRA KUMAR AND ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr Ankit Singh Sinsinwar and Mr.
Ravi Kumar, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ORS. ...Respondents

Through: Ms. Shobhana Takiar, SC for DDA
with Mr. Shivam Takiar, Mr. Prateek
Dhir, Mr. Kuljeet Singh, Advs.
Mr. Manu Chaturvedi, Adv. for MCD.
Mr. Ripudamn Bhardwaj, CGSC with
Mr. Kushagra Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

%

28.04.2026

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers :-

“(a) A writ of certiorari calling for the records of the case for perusal;

(b) A writ of certiorari quashing the action of the Respondents in carrying out any sealing without identification of the public and private land, being illegal, arbitrary, mala-fide unwarranted and irrational and without any justifiable reason or cause, in violation of the rules & regulations and principles of equity, justice and good conscience.



(c) A writ of mandamus directing the Respondents to carry out joint inspection/survey for identification of land in respect of Khasra No. 310, 311, 316 and 317, Village Khichripur, Delhi, before carrying out any kind of sealing/demolition.

(d) A writ of prohibition restraining the respondents from carrying out any sealing/ demolition against the Petitioners property till the joint inspection/survey is carried out at the demised land.

(e) A writ, order or direction in the nature of a writ of mandamus directing the Respondents to pay the cost of this petition to the Petitioner;...”

2. For the reasons stated in the petition, issue notice.

3. Ms. Takiar, learned standing counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent Nos. 1 and 2. Mr. Chaturvedi, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No. 3. Mr. Bhardwaj, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No. 4.

4. A perusal of the prayers in the present petition, shows that the impugned action of sealing of the property is based on the letter dated 23.04.2026, which reads as under:-



Delhi Development Authority
Office of the Deputy Director (LM) East Zone
Room no. 8, DDA Building, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi-110092

No. F1(37)2026/DD/LM/EZ/376

Dated:-23.4.26

To,

Deputy Commissioner of Police
East District, I.P. Extension,
Patparganj, Delhi-10092.

Sub: Request to provide police assistance during joint sealing programme by MCD and DDA against the properties/shops in Khasra no. 311 & 316 of village Khichripur at the instance of the Hon'ble Monitoring Committee.

Sir/Madam,

With reference to above cited subject, it is to inform that a sealing programme against commercial properties running in khasra no. 311 and 316 village Khichripur has been scheduled on 28.04.2026(Tuesday) as per the direction of Hon'ble Monitoring committee. The sealing will be carried out by MCD as per the identification of properties by DDA. The programme will be held under supervision of Asst. Director (LM East zone), DDA and concerned AE of MCD.

You are therefore requested to provide adequate police force at site to maintain the law and order situation during the sealing programme.

The meeting point will be at Police station, Kalyan Puri, Delhi on 28.04.2026 (Tuesday) at 11:00 a.m.

/
Deputy Director
Land Management/East Zone

TRUE COPY

P.T.O

5. Since the sealing programme is proposed to be taken under the direction of the monitoring committee, the petitioners have an alternative



efficacious remedy of challenging the directions of the monitoring committee before the judicial committee.

6. In view of the alternative remedy available, the petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to approach the judicial committee.
7. The respondents shall be mindful of the interim orders passed by this Court from time to time directing status quo.
8. Since, the order of the monitoring committee is not with the petitioner, the same shall be provided to the petitioners within 24 hours.
9. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.
10. The Court has not commented on the merits of the controversy.

JASMEET SINGH, J

APRIL 28, 2026/NG