



2026:DHC:3923



\$~37& 38

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

Date of Decision: **25.04.2026**

IN THE MATTERS OF:

+ **W.P.(C) 7575/2025 & CM APPL. 33798/2025**

M/S EAGLE SANITATION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Deevanshu Sharma, Ms. Simran Chawla, Mr. Kartik Wadhwa & Mr. Deeshant Sharma, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Appearance not given.

38

+ **W.P.(C) 7580/2025 & CM APPL. 33805/2025**

M/S FIBA HARDWYN LOCKS LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Deevanshu Sharma, Ms. Simran Chawla, Mr. Kartik Wadhwa & Mr. Deeshant Sharma, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Advocate for R-1.

Mr. Balendu Shekhar with Mr. Krishna Chaitanya and Mr. Divyansh Singh Dev, Advocates for DPCC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PRIYA
Signing Date:06.05.2026
18:53:27

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:3923



JUDGEMENT

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

(The matter has been taken up today, as 03.03.2026 was declared as a holiday.)

1. The prayer in the instant petitions is for the setting aside of the orders issued by Respondent No. 2/ Delhi Pollution Control Committee (“DPCC”), both of which are dated 01.05.2025. By way of the said orders, Respondent No. 2 has imposed environment compensation of Rs. 6,00,000/- upon the petitioners for environmental damage. The said orders have been passed in furtherance of impugned Show Cause Notices issued by Respondent No. 2, both of which are dated 10.01.2025.

2. The primary contention of the petitioners is that the impugned orders have been passed without considering the reply filed by them, and without affording a hearing opportunity, in violation of the principles of natural justice.

3. At this stage, it may be appropriate to extract the relevant portion of the impugned orders. The order dated 01.05.2025, passed by Respondent No. 2 in W.P.(C) 7580-2025, records the following observations vis-à-vis the reply filed by the petitioner:

“And whereas, the addressee unit has submitted a reply on 23/01/25 & 24/02/2025 which is found to be not satisfactory by the competent authority”

4. Similarly, the order dated 01.05.2025, passed by Respondent No. 2 in W.P.(C) 7575-2025, records the following observations vis-à-vis the reply filed by the petitioner:

“And whereas, the addressee unit has not submitted any reply to the abovementioned SCN.”

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: PRITYA
Signing Date: 06.05.2026
18:53:27

A bare perusal of the above extracts shows that Respondent No.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:3923



2 has failed to give due consideration to the replies filed by the petitioners, or even lay down the reasons as to why such reply was found not satisfactory. Moreover, the Court finds that the observation recorded in W.P.(C) 7575-2025, is entirely erroneous, considering that the petitioner had, in fact, filed a reply, and the same was even acknowledged by Respondent No. 2. Therefore, the impugned order shows a complete non-application of mind on the part of Respondent No. 2.

6. This Court, in *Hi-Print Corporation v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Anr.*¹; *M/s India Navigation Company v. Government of NCT of Delhi & Anr.*²; and *Mangolpuri Industrial Area Phase 1 & 2 CETP Society v. Delhi Pollution Control Committee & Ors.*³ has set aside similar actions of the DPCC. In *Mangolpuri* (*supra*), the Court made the following observations:

“5. The Court, thus, finds that the impugned orders, though record the factum of issuance of the SCN and the consequent reply filed by the petitioners, they, however, do not spell out any reasons as to why the reply was not found to be satisfactory.

*6. The Supreme Court, in Siemens Engg.& Mfg. Co. of India Ltd. v. Union of India*⁶, held that recording of reasons in support of an order is a basic tenet of natural justice. It was further held that the requirement of passing reasoned orders must be observed in its proper spirit; a mere pretence of compliance would not be enough. Further, in *Union of India v. Ibrahim Uddin*⁷, the Supreme Court made the following observations on the importance of passing reasoned orders:

“44. It is a settled legal proposition that not only administrative order, but also judicial order must be supported by reasons, recorded in it. Thus, while deciding an issue, the court is bound to give reasons for its conclusion. It is the duty and obligation on the part of the court to record reasons while disposing of the case. The hallmark of order and exercise of judicial power by a judicial forum is for the

¹ Order dated 07.04.2026 in W.P.(C) 10987/2025.

Signature Not Verified
Order dated 25.03.2026 in W.P.(C) 7357/2025.

Signed By:PRIYA³ Order dated 22.04.2026 in W.P.(C) 4302/2022 and W.P.(C) 6804/2022.

Signing Date:06.05.2026
18:53:27

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:3923



forum to disclose its reasons by itself and giving of reasons has always been insisted upon as one of the fundamentals of sound administration of the justice delivery system, to make it known that there had been proper and due application of mind to the issue before the court and also as an essential requisite of the principles of natural justice. The reason is the heartbeat of every conclusion. It introduces clarity in an order and without the same, the order becomes lifeless. Reasons substitute subjectivity with objectivity. The absence of reasons renders an order indefensible/unsustainable, particularly when the order is subject to further challenge before a higher forum. Recording of reasons is the principle of natural justice and every judicial order must be supported by reasons recorded in writing. It ensures transparency and fairness in decision-making. The person who is adversely affected must know why his application has been rejected. (Vide State of Orissa v. Dhaniram Luhar [(2004) 5 SCC 568 : (2008) 2 SCC (Cri) 49 : AIR 2004 SC 1794] , State of Uttaranchal v. Sunil Kumar Singh Negi [(2008) 11 SCC 205 : (2008) 2 SCC (L&S) 1093] , Victoria Memorial Hall v. Howrah GanatantrikNagrik Samity [(2010) 3 SCC 732 : AIR 2010 SC 1285] and Sant Lal Gupta v. Modern Coop. Group Housing Society Ltd. [(2010) 13 SCC 336 : (2010) 4 SCC (Civ) 904])”

7. Therefore, the Court finds that the impugned orders have been passed in a mechanical and cryptic manner, reflecting non-application of mind. In the absence of reasons, the petitioners would be precluded from effectively seeking further remedy.”

7. The Court, therefore, observes that the ‘one-line rejection’ approach adopted by Respondent No. 2 while passing the impugned orders, does not withstand the scrutiny of law. The reasons for ‘non-satisfaction’ must be explicit and discernible from a perusal of the order. In the instant petitions, however, no such reasons have been recorded.

8. For all the above reasons, the impugned orders passed in the instant petitions will also have to be set aside.

9. Liberty is granted to Respondent No. 2 to pass a fresh order after considering the reply filed by the petitioners, and after affording them a reasonable opportunity of hearing.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By: PRITYA
Signing Date: 06.05.2026
18:53:27

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By: PURUSHAINDR
KUMAR KAURAV



2026:DHC:3923



10. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petitions, along with all pending applications, stand disposed of.

11. All rights and contentions of the parties on the merits are left open.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 25, 2026/SH/SV

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PRIYA
Signing Date:06.05.2026
18:53:27

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV