



\$~27

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

+ LPA 814/2023 CM APPL. 64402/2023

SMT SARLA KAUSHIK

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Shalen Bhardwaj, Advocate

versus

MUNCIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI THROUGH ITS
COMMISIONER & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms Avni Singh Panel, Advocate for
GNCTD with Mr. Abhishek Yadav,
Advocate
Mr. Sharique Hussain and Ms Kirti
Garg, Advocates for R-5 to R-8

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

09.04.2026

1. This appeal raises a challenge against an order dated 02.11.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge, wherein the Single Judge in paragraph '4' onwards has stated as under: -

“4. The compilation of documents dated 02.11.2023 and the status report dated 31.10.2023 are taken on record.

5. In view of the aforesaid position, Mr. Aroraa submits that there is no impediment for grant of an electricity connection to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, Mr. Jain states that the electricity connection will be given to the petitioner subject to her making a fresh application for the same, and fulfilling all commercial and codal formalities.

7. If the petitioner makes a fresh application within a period of one week from today, the concerned officer of respondent No. 5 is directed to process the same and provide an electricity connection



within two weeks thereafter, subject to compliance of all formalities.

8. The writ petition stands disposed of with these observations.”

2. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties for some time, it is noted that the respondents have, pursuant to the order of the learned Single Judge decided the application filed by the petitioner for electricity connection vide annexures A-6 & A-7, wherein they have notified certain deficiencies.

3. The only deficiency as exists and also conceded by the counsel for the respondents is the flat wherein the electricity connection need to be granted is situated on the ground floor (above the stilt area), whereas according to the respondents, it is at the upper ground floor, because of which the connection has not been granted.

4. If this being the deficiency the respondents while deciding the application filed by the petitioner shall treat the property as situated above the stilt area, by treating the ground floor as upper ground floor for the purpose of their records only and decide the same.

5. We make it clear that this being the only objection highlighted by the counsel for the respondents no further objection shall be put henceforth. The respondents shall proceed to decide the application as submitted by the petitioner within one week from today.

6. The present appeal stands disposed of.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

APRIL 9, 2026/rhc