



\$~65 and 66

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6528/2026 & CM APPL. 32251/2026, CM APPL. 32252/2026**

ANUJ BADHWAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vinod Kumar Mantoo, Mr. Hem Kumar & Ms. Niharika Mantoo, Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Akhil Mittal, Standing Counsel for MCD.

66

+ **W.P.(C) 6532/2026 & CM APPL. 32263/2026, CM APPL. 32264/2026**

RACHNA BADHWAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vinod Kumar Mantoo, Mr. Hem Kumar & Ms. Niharika Mantoo, Advocates.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Prabhat Kumar, Advocate for MCD.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL**

**ORDER**

%

**13.05.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the common order dated 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2026, passed by the Appellate Tribunal, MCD (hereinafter



‘ATMCD’), in the appeals filed by the petitioner, whereby the appeals were dismissed on the ground of limitation.

2. Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent/MCD points out that the aforesaid order is appealable in terms of Section 347-D of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 (hereinafter ‘DMC Act’).

3. In terms of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in ***Amrik Singh Lyallpuri vs. Union of India***, (2011) 6 SCC 535, the Appellate Authority under Section 347-D of the DMC Act would be the District Judge instead of the Administrator.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petitions are disposed of, while giving liberty to the petitioners to invoke the statutory remedy of appeal.

5. No coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioners for a period of three (3) weeks, in order for the petitioners to invoke the statutory remedy of appeal.

6. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

**AMIT BANSAL, J**

**MAY 13, 2026**

*at*