



\$~31

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1099/2026 & CM APPL. 5349/2026**

**VIJAY MUTNEJA**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Akriti Verma, Advocate.  
(Through *video-conferencing*)

versus

**AIRCEL LIMITED THROUGH ITS MONITORING COMMITTEE  
& ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Udbhav Nanda and Mr. Saurav  
Panda, Advocates for R-1. (Through  
*video-conferencing*)  
Mr. Kapil Dutta, Standing Counsel  
for MCD.  
Mr. Raj Kumar Yadav & Ms. Preethi  
Gothwal, Advocates for R-4.  
(*through VC*)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL**

**ORDER**

%

**23.03.2026**

1. As per the report of the Registry, notice could not be served on respondents no.1 and 2.
2. Counsel appears on behalf of the respondent no.1 and submits that the respondent no.1 has nothing to do with the mobile tower and the same is under the control of the respondent no.2/GTL Infrastructure Limited.
3. None appears on behalf of the respondent no.2.
4. In these circumstances, upon the petitioner taking steps, let fresh



service be affected upon the respondent no.2.

5. The petitioner is permitted to affect *dasti* service upon the respondent no.2.
6. Response, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks.
7. List on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2026.

**AMIT BANSAL, J**

**MARCH 23, 2026**  
**ds**