



\$~23

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

% **Date of Decision: 11th December, 2025**

+ W.P.(C) 6974/2025 & CM APPL. 31502/2025, CM APPL. 55086/2025, CM APPL. 59748/2025

ADITY SHIVCHARAN RATHODPetitioner

Through: None.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Mr. Yash Narain and Ms. Pragya Yadav, Advocates for R-2/SHO

Email: rajesh.laws@gmail.com

Mob: 8802991089

Insp. Ram Yadav, PS Jamia Nagar

Mob: 8076444401

Mr. Prabhsahay Kaur, SC for DDA with Mr. Bir Inder Singh and Mr. A. Mishra, Advocates

Mob: 7317391437

Email: sahayk@gmail.com

Mr. M. Hasibuddin, and Ms. Gracey Sachdeva, Advocates for R-4

Mob: 8800516037

Email: sachdevagracey@gmail.com

Mr. Tarunvir Singh Khehar, Advocate for MCD (through VC)

Email - contactuskla@gmail.com

Mobile – 9910122225

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (ORAL):

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondent no. 1-Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD"), to take steps against the ongoing illegal and unauthorized construction being carried out by respondent no. 4 in the plot measuring 200 sq. yds., out of the property



bearing No. 394-395 (adjoining Mumtaz Apartment 375-376), Gali No. 17, Main Road, Zakir Nagar, Jamia Nagar, Khasra No. 134/1, 167 and 169, Delhi-110025.

2. During the course of hearing, it has come to the fore that the present writ petition has been filed by using the name of the petitioner, i.e., Aditi Shivcharan Rathod, without her authorization.

3. It has been brought forth before this Court that various petitions have been filed by different names, through the same counsel and using the same set of documents, by raising similar pleas, as are raised in the present writ petition.

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 4 has brought the attention of this Court to an order dated 20th August, 2025, passed in *W.P.(C) 12607/2025*, titled as “*Adity Shivcharan Rathod Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors.*”, filed by the petitioner herein, with respect to another property, wherein again, the petitioner had submitted that the said property belonged to her.

5. Further, in the said writ petition, i.e., *W.P.(C) 12607/2025*, the petitioner had taken the same plea to show that the property belonged to her and had supported the said plea by relying upon forged and fabricated documents, i.e., a General Power of Attorney (“GPA”), Agreement to Sell, affidavit, etc., and had filed the petition on the said ground.

6. Thus, it has been brought forth that the petitioner has approached this Court with unclean hands.

7. The details of the various writ petitions filed by the petitioner in her own name or by other names, as informed by learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 4, are as follows:

I. *W.P.(C) 12607/2025*, titled as “*Adity Shivcharan Rathod Versus*



Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors.”.

II. W.P.(C) 6799/2025, titled as “*Jyoti Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors.”.*

III. W.P.(C) 6524/2025, titled as “*Seema Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors.”.*

IV. W.P.(C) 6055/2025, titled as “*Pushpa Pandey Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors.”.*

8. On account of the aforesaid facts, the matter had been referred to the Deputy Commissioner of Police (“DCP”) (South-East), to undertake an investigation as to how different petitions are being filed before this Court by the petitioner on the ground that the respective properties therein are owned by the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, a Status Report dated 10th December, 2025 has been filed by the DCP (South-East), which is reproduced as under:

“ STATUS REPORT ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT NO. 2/SHO

xxx xxx xxx

1. It is submitted that the present W.P. (Civil) No. 6974/2025 titled Adity Shivcharan Rathod Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors. was filed before this Hon'ble High Court by Ms. Awantika, Advocate. It is relevant to mention here that *vide* order dated 22.05.2025, this Hon'ble Court observed as follows: “the present writ petition has been filed for directions against the respondent No. 1 (MCD) to take immediate steps to stop the ongoing illegal and unauthorized construction being carried out by respondent No. 4 (Javed land owner) in plot measuring 200 sq. yds. of property bearing Plot No. 394-395 part of Khasra No. 134/1, 167 and 169, (Adjoining Mumtaz Apartment 375-376), Gali No. 17, Main Road, Zakir Nagar, Jamia Nagar, New Delhi-110025 including 50 sq. yards land of the petitioner (Adity Shivcharan), encroached by the respondent No. 4 and issued notices to all parties”.



2. That meanwhile, CM APPL. 59748/2025 was filed in W.P.(Civil) 6974/2025 on behalf of respondent No. 4 (Javed, the land owner) wherein, it was brought before this Hon'ble Court that various petitions have been filed by the petitioner by different names through the same

counsel and using the same set of documents by raising similar pleas, as in the present writ petition. It was also brought to the attention of this Hon'ble Court that *vide* order dated 20.08.2025, passed in W.P.(C) 12607/2025 titled as "Adity Shivcharan Rathod Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors.", filed by the petitioner herein, with respect to a property, wherein, the petitioner again submitted that the said property belonged to the petitioner. Even in the said writ petition, i.e. W.P.(C) 12607/2025, the petitioner herein had used the same plea to show that the property belongs to her and supported the same by using forged and fabricated documents, i.e. General Power of Attorney ("GPA"), Agreement to Sell, affidavit etc. and filed the petition on the said ground.

3. That *vide* order dated 19.09.2025, this Hon'ble Court had ordered that considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, the respondent No. 2 i.e. Deputy Commissioner of Police ("DCP"), (South-East), Sarita Vihar, Delhi-110076, is directed to undertake an investigation as to how different petitions are being filed before this Court by the petitioner on the ground that the respective petitioners are owners of the said properties.
4. In compliance of the above directions, investigation has been carried out in the matter. During course of investigation, the Petitioner Aditi Shivcharan Rathod has been traced and examined. During examination Mrs. Aditi Shivcharan Rathod stated that she has not filed writ petition W.P.(Civil) 6974/2025, in Hon'ble Delhi High Court against unauthorized construction in property bearing Plot No. 394-395, area measuring 250 sq yds. out of Khasra No. 134/1, 167 & 169, Main Road Gali No. 17, Zakir Nagar, Okhla, Jamia Nagar, New Delhi-110025. She further stated that neither she purchased any property in her name in Delhi nor filed writ petitions in Hon'ble Delhi High Court against unauthorized construction. She further stated that she never purchased property area measuring 50 sq yds. out of Khasra No. 134/1, 167 & 169, Main Road Gali No. 17, Zakir Nagar, Okhla, Jamia Nagar, New Delhi-110025. Mrs. Aditi Shivcharan Rathod has also denied his signature on



the above said property documents attached with the writ petition i.e. GPA, Agreement to Sell and Purchase, Affidavit, Will, Possession Letter, Receipt all dated 16.07.2010 shown executed by Mr. Amjad Ahmad S/o Mr. Rashid Ahmad R/o H. No. 15, Harkesh Nagar, Village Okhla, New Delhi in her favour. She further stated that some unknown persons have misused her Aadhar ID, prepared the above said forged property documents in her name and filed the same in Hon'ble Delhi High Court with W.P.(C) 6974/2025 with their ulterior motive and she have no concerned with the above said persons, property documents and Writ Petitions.

5. During the course of investigation, efforts were made to trace and examine Mr. Amjad Ahmad S/o Mr. Rashid Ahmad R/o H. No. 15, Harkesh Nagar, Village Okhla, New Delhi, Mr. Vinod Kumar S/o Mr. Jagat Kumar R/o Kotla Village, New Delhi, Mrs. Sarita Singh W/o Mr. Arjun Singh R/o Devli Village, New Delhi, Mr. Hardeep Singh S/o Mr. Manveer Singh R/o Anangpur Village, Faridabad, (Haryana), Mr. Sachin Yadav S/o Mr. Vinod Yadav R/o Kotla Village, New Delhi, Mr. Dinesh Kumar S/o Mr. Ram Kumar R/o Babarpur, New Delhi, all persons who were shown executor or witnesses of chain of the above said property Plot No. 394-395, area measuring 200 sq yds. out of Khasra No. 134/1, 167 & 169, Main Road Gali No. 17, Zakir Nagar, Okhla, Jamia Nagar, New Delhi-110025 documents attached with the writ petition W.P.(C) 6974/2025, but no one is traceable, hence could not be examined.
6. During course of investigation, Respondent No. 4 in W.P.(C) 6974/2025 i.e. property owner Mr. Mohd. Javed Khan S/o Late Mohd. Ayub Khan R/o H. No. 374, part of Khasra No. 134/1, 167 & 169, Gali No. 17, Main Road Jakir Nagar, Jamia Nagar, New Delhi-110025 has been examined, who stated that in the year 1979, his father had purchased the above property area 250 sq. yds. in the name of his mother's Late Wazida Khatoon from Mr. Ram Pal S/o Late Hazari R/o Village Khijrabad, New Delhi through GPA, Agreement to Sell & Purchase, Will, Possession Letter, Payment Receipt of Rs. 20,000/- all dated 07.03.1979. After



developing the same, his family is residing there from year 1981. He further stated that due to old building, his family had demolished the said construction and started to build new construction without obtaining approved building plan as the area is falls under unauthorized colony.

7. From the investigation conducted so far, it has revealed that some unknown persons have misused Aadhar ID of Mrs. Adity Shivcharan Rathod, prepared the above said forged property documents in her name and filed the same in Hon'ble Delhi High Court along with W.P.(C) 6974/2025 with their ulterior motive while she has no concerned with the above said persons, property documents and Writ Petitions filed in this Hon'ble Court. The status of the various other writ petitions filed by the petitioner by her own name or by other names are as follows:

- a. W.P.(C) 12607/2025 titled as "Adity Shivcharan Rathod Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors.". Disposed of vide order dated 20.08.2025 and Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No. 2 i.e. SHO, Shaheen Bagh, on advance notice, submits that the address of the petitioner is of Maharashtra and in order to assess the status of the property, respondent No. 2 tried to contact the petitioner, however, the petitioner has not been co-operating in any manner, thus, the identity of the petitioner seems to be doubtful. Petitioner Adity Shivcharan Rathod examined who stated that some unknown persons have misused her Aadhar ID, prepared the above said forged property documents in her name and filed the same in Hon'ble Delhi High Court with W.P (C) 12607/2025 with their ulterior motive and she have no concerned with the above said persons, property documents and Writ Petition.
- b. W.P.(C) 6524/2025 titled as Seema Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors. The matter is pending and next date is 18.02.2026. Advocate Awantika appeared through VC for



petitioner. Petitioner Seema has been traced & examined by PS Saheen Bagh who stated that the Aadhaar card (having number 251785426854) used in the petition shown to her is having her photograph, however, the Aadhaar number and the address mentioned on it were incorrect. Whereas, the Aadhar Card provided by Sm^l. Seema Rani has aadhar number as: 203854236297 and address as: 870, Jasour Kheri, (17), Jhajjar, Haryana-124505. She has stated that someone has misused her photograph and prepared a forged Aadhaar card in her name. She also affirmed that she has never owned any property in Delhi, including the areas of Jamia Nagar, Okhla and Shaheen Bagh. The signature of the GPA attached with the main petition having signature of Seema is in Hindi whereas Seema Rani stated that she usually signs in English, which further indicates possible fabrication or misuse of her identity. She further clarified that she has never filed any petition before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court and she had nothing to do with the present petition.

- c. W.P.(C) 6799/2025 titled as Jyoti Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors. The matter is pending and next date is 12.01.2026. The petition was filed by advocate Awantika but none have appeared for the petitioner during hearing. During course of investigation, efforts were made to trace and examine all the persons who were shown executor or witnesses of chain of the property documents attached with the writ petition, but no one is traceable, hence could not be examined.
- d. W.P.(C) 6055/2025 titled as Pushpa Pandey Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi & Ors. On 01.09.2025, the Petition has been dismissed as withdrawn by the petitioner. Petition was filed by advocate Twinkle Meena but during hearing advocate Awantika appeared through VC for petitioner. During course of investigation, efforts were made to trace and examine all the persons who were shown executor or witnesses of chain of the



property documents attached with the writ petition, but no one is traceable, hence could not be examined.

8. It is also pertinent to mention here that Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner i.e. Advocate Awantika has mentioned her office address as D-291, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi in all petitions filed in this Hon'ble Court while she was not located there, later her office address is found at D-291, Defence Colony, New Delhi. She further submitted that the matters were referred to her by advocate Suraj Singh, Mobile No. 7303353280, whom she met at the Delhi High Court, but the Mobile No. is found not exist and so far, there is no clue about advocate Suraj Singh.
9. It has also revealed that in the area of PS Jamia Nagar, Shaheen Bagh etc. some persons are filing frivolous complaints in Police Stations, MCD by forging documents of the property documents and filing PILs in Hon'ble Delhi High Court for illegal construction for their ulterior motive and in pretext of the same by using the MCD/Delhi High Court as a tool they are extorting money from the innocent public/builders and after getting extortion money, they used to withdraw or not pursue the same in the Court.

In view of aforementioned facts and circumstances, the undersigned shall abide by any direction(s) passed by this Hon'ble Court.

Submitted please.

Hr
10.12.2025

(Dr. Hemant Tiwari), IPS
Deputy Commissioner of Police
South East District, New Delhi

”

10. Perusal of the aforesaid Status Report shows that the petitioner, i.e., Ms. Aditi Shivcharan Rathod, was traced and examined by the police. During her examination, Ms. Aditi Shivcharan Rathod stated that she has not filed the present writ petition before this Court. She further stated that she



has neither purchased any property in her name in Delhi nor has she filed any writ petition before this Court against any unauthorized construction.

11. Ms. Aditi Shivcharan Rathod, the petitioner herein has also denied her signatures on the property documents attached with the present writ petition, i.e., the GPA, Agreement to Sell, possession letter and receipt, all dated 16th July, 2010.

12. The police has also recorded the statement of Ms. Aditi Shivcharan Rathod that some unknown persons have misused her Aadhaar Card and forged the property documents in her name to file the present writ petition with some ulterior motives.

13. Thus, the Status Report of the police makes it evident that the Aadhaar Card of Ms. Aditi Shivcharan Rathod has been misused by unknown persons to manufacture and forge certain documents in relation to the property in question in order to file the present petition.

14. Further, the police has categorically stated that the counsel for the petitioner, i.e., Ms. Awanitika was also traced at an address in Defence Colony, i.e., *D-291, Defence Colony, New Delhi*. Ms. Awanitika has submitted that the matters were referred to her by an advocate by the name of Mr. Suraj Singh, Mobile No. 7303353280, whom she had met at the Delhi High Court

15. However, the police has not been able to trace the said advocate, Mr. Suraj Singh.

16. Accordingly, the police is directed to continue with its investigation, and carry out further proceedings in accordance with law, including, lodging of First Information Report (“FIR”) and subsequent appropriate proceedings.

17. Considering the grave revelations brought forth before this Court on the basis of the Report of the police, it is clear that the present petition has



been filed on the basis of forged documents, without any authorization from the petitioner.

18. Accordingly, the role of advocates involved in the present case, i.e., Ms. Awanitika and Mr. Suraj Singh, has to be investigated. In this regard, this Court takes note of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhagwan Singh Versus State of Uttar Pradesh and Others, (2025) 6 SCC 416***, wherein, it has been held as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

43. To create or to assist creating false documents and to use them as genuine knowing them to be false in the Court proceedings, to falsely implicate somebody in the false proceedings filed in the name of the person who had no knowledge whatsoever about the same are the acts attributable to the offences punishable under the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. They are also acts of frauds committed not only on the person sought to be falsely implicated and on the person in whose name such false proceedings are filed without his knowledge and consent, but is a fraud committed on the Courts. No court can allow itself to be used as an instrument of fraud and no court can allow its eyes to be closed to the fact that it is being used as an instrument of fraud. As held by this Court in V. Chandrasekaran v. Administrative Officer [V. Chandrasekaran v. Administrative Officer, (2012) 12 SCC 133 : (2013) 2 SCC (Civ) 136 : (2013) 4 SCC (Cri) 587 : (2013) 3 SCC (L&S) 416] : (SCC p. 151, para 45)

“45. The judicial process cannot become an instrument of oppression or abuse, or a means in the process of the court to subvert justice, for the reason that the court exercises its jurisdiction, only in furtherance of justice. The interests of justice and public interest coalesce, and therefore, they are very often one and the same. A petition or an affidavit containing a misleading and/or an inaccurate statement, only to achieve an ulterior purpose, amounts to an abuse of process of the court.”

44. The matter assumes serious concern when the advocates who are the officers of the Court are involved and when they actively participate in the ill-motivated litigations of the unscrupulous litigants, and assist them in misusing and abusing the process of law to achieve their ulterior purposes.

45. People repose immense faith in the judiciary, and the Bar being an integral part of the justice delivery system, has been assigned a very



crucial role for preserving the independence of justice and the very democratic set-up of the country. The legal profession is perceived to be essentially a service oriented, noble profession and the lawyers are perceived to be very responsible officers of the court and an important adjunct of the administration of justice.

46. In the process of overall depletion and erosion of ethical values and degradation of the professional ethics, the instances of professional misconduct are also on rise. There is a great sanctity attached to the proceedings conducted in the court. Every advocate putting his signatures on the vakalatnamas and on the documents to be filed in the Courts, and every Advocate appearing for a party in the courts, particularly in the Supreme Court, the highest court of the country is presumed to have filed the proceedings and put his/her appearance with all sense of responsibility and seriousness. No professional much less legal professional, is immune from being prosecuted for his/her criminal misdeeds.

47. In the extraordinary facts and circumstances, and considering the gravity and seriousness of the case, when the High Court and the Supreme Court were sought to be taken for a ride and when the entire justice delivery system was sought to be put to stake, by Respondent 3 Mr Sukhpal, Respondent 4 Ms Rinki, and their associates and the advocates concerned, who helped them in forging and fabricating the documents to be filed in the High Court and Supreme Court, and to pursue the false proceedings filed in the name of Bhagwan Singh without his knowledge, consent or authority, we deem it appropriate to hand over the investigation of the case to CBI. CBI shall register the regular case, after holding preliminary inquiry if necessary to do so, against all the persons found involved and responsible, and shall investigate all the links leading to the commission of the alleged crimes and fraud on court.

The Director, CBI is directed to do the needful in this regard and to submit the report to this Court within two months. The office is directed to hand over original record of the application under Section 482 No. 41533 of 2019 and Recall Applications Nos. 3 of 2020, 7 of 2020 and 8 of 2021 and the original record of the instant appeals to the Director, CBI in a sealed cover, after retaining the certified copies of all the records of the said proceedings and instant appeals.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

19. Considering the aforesaid, the matter is referred to the Bar Council of India (“BCI”), to examine and investigate the role of the aforesaid counsels, i.e., Ms. Awanitika and Mr. Suraj Singh, and take appropriate action, in accordance with law.



20. The details of Ms. Awanitika, Advocate, as given in the Vakalatnama attached with the present petition, alongwith the correct address, as identified by the police in its Status Report, are reproduced as under: .

Ms. Awanitika, Advocate
D/4465/2020
D-291, Defence Colony, New Delhi
Mob: 9996165661
Email: awantikaniranjan@gmail.com

21. The BCI is also directed to trace the other advocate, i.e., Mr. Suraj Singh, whose name has been mentioned in the Report of the police.

22. In case required, the BCI is also at liberty to approach the DCP South-East District, New Delhi, for the purposes of obtaining any information, as may be required for the purposes of their investigation. The police shall cooperate with the BCI and share relevant information that may be required by the BCI for inquiry at its end.

23. This Court also takes note of the submission that respondent no. 4 has already approached the Appellate Tribunal MCD (“ATMCD”) and *vide* an order dated 27th October, 2025, a stay has been granted in favour of respondent no. 4 by the ATMCD.

24. Accordingly, the MCD is directed to take appropriate action against the property in question, subject to any order that may be passed by the ATMCD.

25. Accordingly, the present writ petition, along with the pending applications, is disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

DECEMBER 11, 2025

ak