



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 13407/2018 & CM APPL. 74554/2024**

MUNTAZIMA COMMITTEEPetitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Pratap Singh, Mr. Rajbir Singh Bal, Mr. Sanstuti Mishra, Mr. Shivam Kumar, Advs.

Mr. A. Rasheed Qureshi, Adv.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITYRespondent

Through: Ms. Beenashaw N. Soni, Addl. Standing Counsel, DDA with Ms. Mansi Jain and Ms. Katyani Malhotra, Advs.

Ms Manika Tripathy SC for DDA with Mr Ashutosh Kaushik Adv

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

13.03.2026

%

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:

“A. issue a writ, order, direction in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondent to decide and finalize its religious policy expeditiously;

B. issue a writ, order, direction in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ; order or direction to the respondent to decide the application of petitioner for allotment of land expeditiously in the light of the religious policy adopted by respondent for allotment of land for religious places of worship;

C. Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondent to decide the application of



the petitioner on the principle of equality as enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution of India as the respondent has allotted plots of land to other religious denominations after 2002;”

2. Ms. Soni, learned Additional Standing Counsel for the DDA states that prayer A has become infructuous as the said policy is already in place. The policy has already been framed and notified on 11.03.2021.
3. The policy handed over in Court today is taken on record.
4. As regards prayer B is concerned, the same is regarding the respondent to decide the application of the petitioner in the light of the applicable policy.
5. It is therefore directed that the respondent shall treat the present petition as a representation and decide the same in accordance with the extant rules and policy. Before passing the order, the respondent shall give a personal hearing to the petitioner and / or its representative. Since the present petition is pending for the last 8 years, it is expected that the respondent shall do the needful expeditiously and in any case, not later than 6 months from today.
6. The prayer C is subsumed in prayer B.
7. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

MARCH 13, 2026 / (MS)