



\$~85

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 14782/2023 & CM APPL. 58820/2023, CM APPL. 58821/2023, CM APPL. 55283/2024, CM APPL. 66814/2024, CM APPL. 69983/2024, CM APPL. 69984/2024, CM APPL. 23004/2025

INDERPURI RESIDENTS ASSOCIATIONPetitioner

Through: Mr. Jatin Kumar and Mr.
Manish Kumar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Nirvikar Verma, SPC with
Mr. R. P. Meena Aden/HNZM,
Mr. Dharmendra Kumar
SSE/HNZM and Mr. Love
Kumar Gupta CH.OS/HNZM
for R-1.

Ms Radhika Bishwajit Dubey,
CGSC with Ms. Gurleen Kaur
Waraich, Mr. Kritarth
Upadhyay and Mr. Amulya Dev
Mishra, Advs. with SI Karmvir
Sangwan Rajouri Garden
Circle, ASI Devender Pairvi
Officer Traffic for Delhi Police
/ Traffic Police.

Mr. Narender Pal Singh, Adv.
for DPCC.

Ms. Avni Singh, Panel Counsel
GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

11.05.2026

%



1. Through the present writ petition, the Petitioner prays as under :

- “(i) A Writ of Prohibition by quashing/set-aside the Tender bearing no.18-2022/23-WV issued by Respondent no.1.*
- (ii) A Writ of Prohibition by quashing/set-aside any other tender/order issued by Respondent(s) for converting bridge no 26 (near Gurudwara) Naraina Vihar Delhi from FOB (Foot Over Bridge) to two wheeler vehicle movement bridge.*
- (iii) Directions may be passed to Respondent No.2 & 3 for restraining the traffic flow from the said bridges.*
- (iv) A Writ of mandamus or any other appropriate Writ Order or Direction in the nature of Mandamus directing the Respondents to take appropriate action as per law.*
- (v) Pass any other or further directions, orders or writ as this Hon’ble Court may, in the facts and circumstance and in the interest of justice deems fit and proper.”*

2. The Petitioner herein is a Resident Welfare Association.

3. It is pointed out that a foot over bridge was in existence for facility of residents. With the passage of time, it appears that the requirement was felt to construct an over-bridge which can be used for pedestrian as well as two-wheeler movement.

4. The Petitioner claims that the land was allotted by Municipal Corporation of Delhi for construction of foot over bridge and not for two-wheeler movement.

5. The Petitioner also claims that certain trees will have to be felled for which permission has not been obtained. Reference has been made to certain previous orders passed by the Courts.

6. Learned counsel representing the Respondents submits that the Railways do not need any permission for construction of a bridge which can be used for pedestrian as well as two-wheeler movement, however, for felling trees, appropriate sanction shall be taken from the concerned authorities. He further submits that orders passed by courts shall also be complied with.

7. In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of.



Pending applications also stand disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 11, 2026
'KDK'