



\$~3

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6374/2026 & CM APPL. 31410/2026**

DEEPAK JAIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Harish Kohli, Mr. Nitesh Kumar,
Mr. Rohit Raman and Mr. Rohit
Singh, Advocates.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Addl. S.C. with
Mr. Raghav Alok, Asstt. S.C., for
NDMC.
Mr. Hari Chand (Clerical Assistant,
NDMC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

% **18.05.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 6th April, 2026 passed by the respondent/NDMC.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that it has wrongly been recorded in the impugned order that only 1 out of the 82 payments made by the petitioner is reflected in the statement of account. Para 4 of the impugned order is set out below:-

4. The matter was referred to the Accounts Branch for detailed verification of the claims made by the petitioner. As per the findings of the Accounts Branch:-

- a. A total of 82 payments were claimed by the petitioner as not reflected in the Statement of Account.



b. Out of these, only one payment of ₹14,625/- (Cheque No. 285077 dated March 2009) was found credited in NDMC bank records and has been duly accounted for.

c. The remaining 81 claimed payments could not be substantiated, as no corresponding credit entries were traceable in the NDMC bank records.

A revised Statement of Account has accordingly been prepared by the Accounts Branch after due verification.

3. While issuing notice in the present petition on 11th May, 2026, counsel for the respondent/NDMC was directed to supply a legible copy of the statement of account annexed with the impugned order dated 6th April, 2026, to the counsel for the petitioner.

3.1 The same has been duly supplied.

3.2. The statement of account has been handed over in Court today and the same is taken on record.

4. A perusal of the statement of account shows that the amount due is Rs.52,16,618/- which is reflected in the impugned order.

5. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent/NDMC has not explained the manner of calculation of interest in the statement of account.

6. In the considered opinion of this Court, all these aspects cannot be examined by this Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226. If the petitioner has any grievance with regard to calculation of the amount, including interest, by the respondent, it would be open for the petitioner to invoke appropriate remedies available in law.

7. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to invoke appropriate remedies that may be available in law.

8. Pending application stands closed.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MAY 18, 2026/Rzu