



\$~8

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

+ W.P.(C) 17113/2025 with CM APPL. 70383/2025

SATINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Counsel (appearance not given)

versus

THE COMMISSIONER MCD OF DELHI
& ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anubhav Gupta, ASC for MCD.
Mr. Arjun Mahajan, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Monica Batra, Mr.
Apoorv Upmanyu & Mr. Ravikant
Kumar, Advocates for STF.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER
30.03.2026

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions for taking action against the unauthorized construction in the property bearing no. WZ-174, Gali No. 4, Old Sahib Pura, near Singh Sabha Gurudwara, New Delhi-110018 (hereinafter 'subject property').

2. Notice in the present petition was issued *vide* order dated 12th November, 2025 and the petitioner was directed to file an affidavit as to the number of petitions filed by him. Paragraph no. 8 of the said order is set out below:

“8. The petitioner is directed to file an affidavit as to the number of petitions filed by him, clearly giving the details of each petition, for which property, and the outcome of the said petitions.”



3. No such affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioner.
4. Status report has been filed on behalf of the respondent/ MCD, wherein it is stated that the subject property is an old building existing from ground floor to the second floor and was occupied. No construction activity was seen in progress. It is stated in the status report that the photographs filed with the petition are of another property being *WZ-161, Old Sahibpura, MBS Nagar, New Delhi*, which appears to be constructed recently. Accordingly, the said property has been booked and a show cause notice has been issued to the owner/ occupier of the said property. The status report also states that the petitioner is residing at a distance of more than half (1/2) a kilometre from the subject property.
5. Admittedly, the petitioner in the present case does not have any connection with the property in question. The petitioner has failed to show as to how any fundamental or legal right of the petitioner is being affected by any alleged construction activity carried out in the subject property. Further the petitioner has failed to file the affidavit giving details of previous petitions filed by him as directed *vide* order dated 12th November, 2025.
6. From the facts noted above, it appears that the present writ petition has been filed for oblique purposes and is a complete abuse of the process of the Court.
7. In this backdrop, this Court is not inclined to exercise its power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to grant the relief sought by the petitioner.
8. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.



AMIT BANSAL, J

MARCH 30, 2026

at