



\$~53

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8587/2011**

SANGEETA GARG AND ORS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nikhilesh Krishanan, Mr. Jai Pratap
and Mr. Abhishek Bhushan Singh,
Advocates.

versus

THE LT. GOVERNOR, DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Nakul Ahuja and Mr. Anish Dhingra,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

28.05.2025

%

CM APPL. 33849/2025 (for correction in the order dated 06.02.2025)

1. The present writ petition was filed by Ms. Sangeeta Garg, Mr. Ankit Garg and Mr. Bankim Garg praying for setting aside the order passed by DDA whereby the perpetual lease deed with respect to the suit property was cancelled.
2. During pendency of the abovesaid writ petition, there were two applications which had been filed seeking impleadment.
3. Both these applications seeking impleadment were allowed by this Court on 06.02.2025.
4. Fact however remains, that in the impleadment application filed by Ms. Madhu Arora (CM APPL. 51350/2024), she had, *inter alia*, claimed that she be impleaded as petitioner in place of the existing petitioners and she also prayed that the name of respondent Nos. 4 and 5 be deleted from the array of parties.
5. She claimed herself to be the subsequent purchaser of property in question.
6. While allowing the abovesaid application, this Court had, in its order dated 06.02.2025, allowed them to be impleaded as respondents and there was a direction to file amended memo of parties.
7. The present application has been moved seeking correction/modification of the abovesaid order. It is submitted that Ms. Madhu Arora, merely, wanted her

W.P.(C) 8587/2011

1



impleadment in place of the existing petitioners and such fact has not been amply clarified.

8. Learned counsel for applicant Ms. Madhu Arora submits that he also represents the abovesaid three petitioners also and they also have no objection to the abovesaid request.

9. Learned counsel for applicant Ms. Madhu Arora also submits that since there is no formal notice of said application to respondent Nos. 4 and 5, for the time being, he would not even insist for their deletion of their names from the array of parties.

10. Since the original petitioners have no objection to the abovesaid request and since learned counsel for DDA, who appears on advance notice, has also no objection to the abovesaid limited request, the order dated 06.02.2025 is modified to the extent that while allowing the application moved by Ms. Madhu Arora, she would be impleaded as petitioner in place of the earlier three petitioners and names of the respondent Nos.4 and 5 would continue to be on record.

11. However, with respect to the other applicant Mr. Sunil Garg, as ordered earlier, he would be impleaded as respondent in the present petition.

12. Since Ms. Madhu Arora has been substituted as petitioner, she would be at liberty to make necessary amendments in the writ petition.

13. Let amended writ petition and amended memo of parties be, accordingly, filed within two weeks from today.

14. The application stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 28, 2025/ss/js

W.P.(C) 8587/2011

2