



\$~26

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 7472/2022**
MAHABIR PRASAD & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Samrat Pasriccha, Mr. Sumit
Teterwal, Ms. Saudamini Sharma, Mr.
Rajkumar Maurya, Ms. Rohini
Narayanan, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Arun Birbal, Adv. for DDA

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

% **27.01.2026**

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

“(a) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondent to fulfil its obligation and construct the boundary wall for block D Sector 15 Rohini, New Delhi for which the money has already been earmarked from the funds collected at the time of allotment of flats.

(b) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondent to produce all records relating to the construction of the peripheral boundary wall in Block D Sector 15 Rohini.”

2. The brief facts are that petitioners are resident of flats in Sector 15,



Block D, Rohini, New Delhi constructed by the Delhi Development Authority (“**DDA**”) and allotted under “Registration Scheme on New Pattern 1979 of Intending Purchasers of Flats to be constructed by the Delhi Development Authority”.

3. Mr. Pasriccha, learned counsel for the petitioners, states that the respondents have failed in their statutory obligation in making a boundary wall for LIG and MIG flats in Block D, Sector 15, Rohini.
4. He further draws my attention to the Minutes of Meeting of the DDA dated 16.04.2018, wherein under issue No. 6, it has categorically been held that the boundary wall shall be constructed wherever feasible. He further states that the action is required to be taken by Chief Engineer, Rohini.
5. Mr. Birbal, learned counsel for respondent No. 1/DDA, has drawn my attention to the counter-affidavit on behalf of the respondent No. 1/DDA and more particularly paragraph Nos. 6-8, which reads as under:-

*“6-8. Contents of paras 6-8 are denied. It is denied that DDA has been reluctant to carrying out the development of the area. The area in issue is already having the peripheral boundary in the form of wall and iron grills. The area in issue is depicted in the pocket plan annexed to this affidavit as **Annexure-A**. The area in issue in this pocket plan is enclosed by four sides marked 1, 2 3 & 4.*

*(a). The side marked 1 along the western Yamuna Canal is having a boundary wall and iron grill. This is shown by the photograph attached as **Annexure-B** to this affidavit.*



(b). The side marked 2 in the pocket plan is having an iron grill as shown in photograph annexed as Annexure-C to this affidavit.

(c). The side marked 3 in pocket plan is covered having shops. The blank spaces between these shops are having iron grills as shown in photograph annexed as Annexure-D to this affidavit.

(d). The side marked 4 in pocket plan is having an iron grill as shown in Annexure-E to this affidavit.

The document dated 18.01.1990, on which reliance has been placed by the petitioner was part of internal correspondence for making assessment of cost of the flats between the concerned offices of DDA and not addressed to the petitioners. It is not the case of the petitioners that they were promised the building of boundary wall by DDA as desired by them. It would appear that the. petitioner did not raise an issue for about twenty-five years after the allotments.”

6. He states that the DDA has already constructed the peripheral boundary wall as general safety and security measure for the residents of the concerned area.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.
8. In view of the above, and since as per the stand of DDA that the peripheral wall stands erected/ protected by iron grills, it is directed that if any area needs additional reinforcement, the petitioners may make a representation along with photographs, to the respondents and the same shall be duly looked into and remedial measures shall be taken in



accordance with law and expeditiously and not later than 4 weeks from the representation.

9. The direction is only limited to construction of peripheral wall of the concerned area.
10. With these directions, the petition is disposed of, granting liberty to the petitioners to revive the petition in case the directions are not complied with.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/sp