



2025:DHC:7827



\$~59

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of decision: 08<sup>th</sup> September, 2025**+ **W.P.(C) 13710/2025 & CM APPL. 56308/2025, CM APPL. 56309/2025****M/S GHT LOGISTICS**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ayush Sexena, Ms. Nisha Sachdeva, and Mr. Gaurav Kumar, Advocates  
Mob: 9953706040

versus

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS. ....Respondents**

Through: Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocate for R-2 & 3  
Mob: 9811188892  
Ms. Meherunnisa Anand Jaitley and Mr. Dev Pratap Shahi, Advocates for MCD  
Mob: 9717100486  
Email: [meherunnisa.anand@gmail.com](mailto:meherunnisa.anand@gmail.com)  
Mr. Madhu Sudan Bhayana, Advocate for R-4 & R-5  
Mob: 9891617861

**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J (ORAL):**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking release of the petitioner's vehicle bearing registration no. DL1GC-5581, along with its container, on the basis that the petitioner already has a No Objection Certificate ("NOC") dated 05<sup>th</sup> August, 2025, duly approved by the



Transport Department, Government of NCT of Delhi (“GNCTD”) in terms of the Guidelines for Handling End of Life Vehicles in Public Places of Delhi, 2024 (“ELV Guidelines”).

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a reputed Cold Chain Logistic Company, engaged in the lawful business of transportation of goods carriage, including, transportation of perishable items requiring refrigeration.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner had applied for an NOC in respect of three vehicles, through the VAHAN Portal of the GNCTD on 28<sup>th</sup> July, 2025.

4. It is submitted that the vehicle in question of the petitioner was seized by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“MCD”) on 05<sup>th</sup> August, 2025. He submits that at the time of the seizure, the petitioner informed the officials that an online application for the NOC had already been submitted. However, without affording an opportunity to produce proof or to be heard, the vehicle, which is a refrigerated van, fitted with an expensive self-engine driver refrigerated AC machine and an insulated container, was impounded.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner’s pending NOC application in respect of vehicle no. DLIGC-5581 was approved by the competent authority, barely two hours after the petitioner’s vehicle was impounded.

6. Thus, it is submitted that on the very day of the seizure itself, the respondent no. 3 had certified the entitlement of the petitioner to transfer the vehicle in terms of the ELV Guidelines.

7. Responding to the present writ petition, learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 1-MCD submits that at the time when the vehicle was



impounded, there was no NOC issued by the Transport Department. She submits that since now there is an NOC from the Transport Department, GNCTD, the MCD has no objection to release the vehicle in question.

8. Learned counsel appearing for respondent nos. 4 and 5, i.e., the scrapper submits that the vehicle in question has still not been scrapped. However, he submits that the scrapper acted in terms of the directions of the MCD, and therefore, the towing away charges ought to be paid.

9. This Court notes that the Supreme Court *vide* order dated 12<sup>th</sup> August, 2025, passed in *W.P.(C) 13029/1985*, titled as “*M.C. Mehta Versus Union of India & Ors.*”, has categorically directed as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

**2. In the meantime, we direct that no coercive steps be taken against the owners of the vehicles on the ground that they are 10 years old (in case of Diesel engine) and 15 years old (in case of Petrol engine).**”

*(Emphasis Supplied)*

10. Thus, it is apparent that the Supreme Court has directed that no coercive steps be taken against the owners of the vehicles on the ground that their vehicles are ten years old in case of diesel engine, and fifteen years old in case of petrol engine.

11. Considering the submissions made before this Court, and considering the aforesaid order passed by the Supreme Court, it is directed that the respondents shall release the vehicle of the petitioner forthwith.

12. The petitioner is directed to approach the respondent nos. 4 and 5, i.e., Nirvana Scrappers, and pay the towing away charges, as may be indicated by the scrapper.

13. Subject to the petitioner paying the towing away charges, the vehicle of the petitioner shall be released forthwith.



2025:DHC:7827



14. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition, along with the pending applications, is disposed of.

**SEPTEMBER 8, 2025**

ak

**MINI PUSHKARNA, J**