



\$~24

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

+ W.P.(C) 10939/2020, CM APPLs. 34276/2020, 19645/2024 & 73946/2024

ANIL DUTT SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manoj K. Dwivedi with Mr. Bhupesh K. Pathak and Mr. Maneesh Pathak, Advocates.

versus

THE SPECIAL TASK FORCE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashutosh Kaushik, Advocate for STF/DDA.  
Mr. Tushar Sannu, Standing Counsel for MCD.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

%

**09.01.2026**

1. The principal grievance raised in the present petition is that the compliance and directions issued in WP(C) No. 6279/2016 be placed on record, subject to the provisions of Section 466A of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 and the Central Civil Service (Conduct) Rules, 1964 along with the Action Taken Reports (ATRs) in respect of certain properties for which this Court had directed action in WP(C) No. 6844/2012.
2. The petitioner further seeks directions for furnishing the inspection reports prepared at the initial stage of construction of the subject properties involved in WP(C) No. 6279/2016. The petitioner has also prayed for directions relating to the reconstruction of certain demolished portions of the



petitioner's flat and for grant of reasonable compensation. At the outset, it is seen that such reliefs are not amenable to the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

3. Having noted the aforesaid background, a perusal of the order dated 10.10.2018 passed in WP(C) No. 6279/2016 would reveal that the Division Bench of this Court had directed the then Corporation to take appropriate action and to file a status report before the Special Task Force (STF).

4. Mr. Ashutosh Kaushik, learned counsel appearing for the DDA, submits that an affidavit dated 18.03.2025 has been filed by the said authority and that the STF is continuously monitoring the grievances raised by the petitioner. He further draws the attention of the Court to the minutes of the meeting dated 18.10.2024, which reflect that the status of 176 properties was considered, and that the action in that regard is a continuing process which is required to be taken to its logical conclusion in accordance with the procedure being followed by the said authority.

5. At this stage, the Court is of the view that there is no occasion to interdict the proceedings or to issue any further directions to the STF. In the event the petitioner's grievances are not fully redressed, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the STF by way of a comprehensive representation and, thereafter, to avail remedies in accordance with law.

6. With the aforesaid direction, this petition stands disposed of. Pending applications shall also stand disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**JANUARY 9, 2026**

tr/mj