$~21

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC011063752025**

\+ **W.P.(C) 19631/2025 & CM APPL. 82007/2025**

ANJNEY LOYS PVT LTD .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. A. Maittri, Ms. Radhika Khushaldas, Mr. Rakshit Upadhyay & Ms. Parul Sharma, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rohan Jaitley, CGSC & Mr. Akshay Sharma, GP with Mr. Dev Pratap Shahi, Adv. for UOI

Mr. Rishi Yogesh Pandey, Adv. for Punjab & Sind Bank (through VC)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

O R D E R

% 03.11.2026

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner challenges the letter dated 20.11.2025 issued by the Respondent No. 2 to the Chief Manager, Punjab and Sind Bank claiming that Government of India is the owner of the land at 9, Rajpur Road, Civil Lines, New Delhi-110054. It is claimed that the petitioner had wrongly mortgaged the property with the Bank.

2. In the opinion of this Court, no prayer can be sought for quashing a letter that may have been written by any Officer to the Bank.

3. It is pertinent to note that jurisdiction exercised under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is extraordinary and discretionary.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 05/11/2026 at 11:26:07

Parties are entitled to seek recourse to such remedy in order to challenge a substantive action which may affect the rights of a party. Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot be invoked for the purpose of seeking quashing of administrative communications, particularly when the same does not, by itself, operate to prejudice or take away any enforceable right of the party.

4. In the present case, an officer has written a letter to the Bank stating that the land purportedly owned by the petitioner is under the ownership and jurisdiction of the Land & Development Office and sought information from the bank regarding under what authority the petitioner has mortgaged the said property with the bank.

5. A perusal of the contents of the communication indicates that the same is essentially in the nature of an inquiry seeking clarification from the Bank regarding the circumstances in which the property was mortgaged by the petitioner. The said communication does not purport to cancel, invalidate or otherwise extinguish any right or interest claimed by the petitioner in respect of the property.

6. Thus, merely the opinion of an Officer, which does not, in the opinion of this Court, have an effect of taking away any right of the petitioner, cannot be challenged before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

8. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 3, 2026
"SS"

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 05/11/2026 at 11:26:07