



\$~87

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

% **Date of Decision: 15th October, 2025**

+ W.P.(C) 15914/2025

SENIOR CITIZEN RAJAN KUMAR JAINPetitioner

Through: Mr. Gaurav Manuja, Advocate
(M: 9582156789)

Email: kmglegaldelhl@gmail.com

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI THROUGH ITS
COMMISSIONERRespondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Goel, SC-MCD with Ms.
Dimple Aggarwal, Ms. Varsha, Mr.
Himanshu Goel, Advocates
(M:9810215488)

Email: sunilgoel71@gmail.com

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

MINI PUSHKARNA, J (ORAL):

1. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the Show Cause Notice dated 17th February, 2025, issued by the respondent-Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD"), under Section 344(1) and 343 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 ("DMC Act").
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition has been filed on account of the fact that the petitioner has now received a Vacation Notice dated 05th August, 2025, issued from the office of the Executive Engineer (Building)-II, City-Sadar Paharganj Zone, MCD.
3. Responding to the present petition, learned counsel for the respondent-MCD submits that the said Vacation Notice dated 05th August,



2025, is pursuant to a Demolition Order dated 24th February, 2025, which has not been attached by the petitioner, along with the present writ petition. He has handed over a copy of the said Demolition Order dated 24th February, 2025, which is taken on record.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-MCD further submits that said Demolition Order has been issued by the MCD, after following the due process of law.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has received only the Vacation Notice dated 05th August, 2025, and has not received the Demolition Order dated 24th February, 2025.

6. Without going into the issue with regard to the fact as to whether the petitioner has received copy of the Demolition Order dated 24th February, 2025, learned counsel for the respondent-MCD is directed to supply a copy of the said Demolition Order to the learned counsel for the petitioner, on the E-mail, which is reflected in today's order.

7. Accordingly, since the Demolition Order already stands passed, the petitioner is required to file a statutory appeal before the Appellate Tribunal MCD ("ATMCD").

8. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be granted limited protection, in order to approach the ATMCD.

9. Considering the submissions made before this Court, it is directed that for a period of four weeks from today, no coercive action shall be taken against the property of the petitioner.

10. It is clarified that the present order is being passed only with a view to allow the petitioner to appear before the ATMCD, to challenge the aforesaid Demolition Order passed by the MCD.



2025:DHC:9193



11. This Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case, which shall be decided by the ATMCD.
12. Rights and contentions of the parties are left open.
13. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

OCTOBER 15, 2025/au

MINI PUSHKARNA, J