



\$~99

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 1984/2026, CM APPL. 9669-9670/2026 and CM APPL. 9672/2026**

SHRI ASHOK KUMAR DHAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv K Garg, Mr. Rajeev Kapoor, Mr. Shivam Bharara, Mr. Aditya Tanwar, Mr. Sahdev sharma, Ms. Navneet Kaur, Advocates

versus

DELHI STATE INDUSTRIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORP. LTD & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Maneesha Dhir, Ms. Varsha Banerjee, Ms. Ayushi Misra, Ms. Vidhi Kapoor, Advocates for R-1. Mr. T. P. Singh, SPC for R-UOI. Mr Syed Abdul Haseeb CGSC with Muhammad Aamir Khan Advocates Dr. B.T Kaul, Ms. Sonia Arora, Mr. Pranjal Jaiswal, Advocates for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER
25.02.2026

%

1. The petitioner is son-in-law of M.L. Fotedar. Respondent no.3 is the son of M.L. Fotedar. The petitioner claims that sometime in the year 1992-93, the Government of NCT of Delhi through DSIIDC published an advertisement for allotment of shed(s) for setting up electronic industry at



Okhla, Phase, II, New Delhi. The said scheme, according to him, they are for unemployed electronic engineers.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that respondent no.3 while allegedly being an employee of respondent no.2, was ineligible. Despite the said ineligibility, respondent no.3 applied for a shed under the said scheme and was allotted shed no.13, Computer Complex, Okhla Phase-II, New Delhi. It is also stated that respondent no.3 got the said shed transferred in the name of a private limited company, in which his wife became a Director. The petitioner submits that after knowing the aforesaid facts, he lodged a complaint dated 04.08.2002 with ONGC and has also brought it to the notice of the Central Vigilance Commission ('CVC'). He also submits that upon the said grievance being raised, respondent no. 3 anticipating adverse action, and at the instance of the authorities sold the said shed factory for a huge amount and from its proceeds, respondent no.3 had purchased a big commercial space in Gurugram, Haryana.

3. The petitioner submits that thereafter on 02.12.2014, again, a request was made to ONGC to look into the matter and to take appropriate steps. He submits that *vide* letter dated 29.05.2025 sent by the CVC, it has been apprised to the petitioner that his complaint has been forwarded to CVO, Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, however, no action has been taken till date.

4. The facts and circumstances, as has been narrated hereinabove, would clearly indicate that the petitioner and respondent no.3 are brother-in-laws. On account of their family dispute, the petitioner seeks to raise certain grievances against alleged illegal allotment of the shed in the year 1992-93. Going by the facts, even the original complaint made by the petitioner is of



the year 2022 and the present petition has been filed in the year 2026 i.e. after almost 24 years.

5. Though, there is no limitation under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, however, the remedy is equitable and discretionary. The apparent unexplained delay would certainly disentitle the petitioner to seek the discretionary remedy. It also appears that respondent no. 3 is going to retire in the year 2026 itself. The petitioner somehow wants to take personal revenge against respondent no.3. The Court has a doubt about the *bonafides* of the petitioner, to invoke the extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

6. In view of the aforesaid, the Court does not find it appropriate to undertake any scrutiny at the instance of the petitioner with respect to the allotment of shed, which had taken place in the year 1992-93. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 25, 2026

Nc/ksr