



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% ***Date of Decision: 14th November, 2025***

+ W.P.(C) 12118/2023 & CM APPL. 30475/2025 & CM APPL.
61990/2025

ALOK RAI

....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Romil Pathak and Mr. Bharat
Shandilia, Advocates.

versus

DDA AND ANR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu and Mr. Parvin
Bansal, Advocates for R-1/DDA.
Mr. Dharmendra Kumar, Mr. Shashi
Bhushan and Mr. Sushant, Advocates
for R-2.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)****REVIEW PET. 315/2025**

1. The present writ petition was disposed of on 24.02.2025.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner seeks review on the premise that a wrong assertion was made by respondent No.2 i.e. Management Committee of the Society that it had revoked the revised sanction plan dated 10.12.2020 and, therefore, no occupant was permitted to extend the balcony.
3. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that a reply to the abovesaid review application has already been filed and no incorrect statement was ever made. He draws attention of the Court to letter dated 13.11.2023 sent by the Society to Delhi Development Authority (hereinafter referred to as "DDA"), whereby DDA was, categorically, requested to revoke the Floor Area Ratio (hereinafter referred to as "FAR") of the extension sanction.



4. He further draws attention to the minutes of the Annual General Body Meeting held on 29.10.2023 whereby the proposal for rolling back of extension/FAR project was agreed and passed by majority.
5. It is submitted that the abovesaid resolution regarding '*rolling back of extension*' clearly means and indicates that the balconies could not have been extended and, if extended, these were required to be brought to its original position.
6. When the present writ petition was disposed of on 24.02.2025, the petitioner, irrespective of the fact whether he could extend the balcony legitimately or not, was also given liberty to file representation with DDA, and DDA was requested to consider the same in accordance with law.
7. Be that as it may, fact remains that there is no error apparent on record, necessitating review of the order. In the garb of review, the petitioner, cannot be permitted to seek re-decision of the matter.
8. The review petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 14, 2025/ss/sa