



\$~23

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CONT.CAS(C) 311/2026, CM APPL. 12512/2026, CM APPL.
12513/2026, CM APPL. 12514/2026, CM APPL. 12515/2026
SULTANPUR ESTATE RESIDENTIAL ASSOCIATION (SERA)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Parth Chadha, Mr. Harshit
Hassanwalia, Mr. Sameer Aggarwal,
Ms. Prachi Maheshwari, Mr. Rayneer
Pandey, Ms. Saher Raunaq, Ms. Jyoti
Pandey and Mr. Aman Singh,
Advocates.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Urvi Mohan, Advocate for
GNCTD.

Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, ASC along with
Mr. Pulkit Garg, Advocate for MCD.
Mr. Nirvikar Verma, SPC for R-4 and
R-6 along with SI Ankit Sharma.
Mr. Hemant Sharma, Advocate for
Respondent No.9.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

24.03.2026

1. The present petition alleges wilful disobedience of the judgment / order dated 06.02.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 4911/2024.
2. It is the petitioner's case that despite the undertaking recorded in paragraph-9 of the said judgment to the effect that no development activities shall be carried out without seeking requisite regulatory approvals including from the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD), the respondent/s have



continued with illegal constructions therein, including laying of roads etc.

3. The judgment / order dated 06.02.2025, *inter alia*, records as under:-

“9. In view of the aforesaid, so far as the apprehension of the petitioner raised in this petition is concerned, the same stands allayed for two reasons, firstly, the land in question already stands urbanised and secondly, a statement has been made on behalf of respondent no.9 that no development of the land shall be undertaken without seeking the requisite approvals, etc. as per the requirement of law including the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957.

10. Learned senior counsel representing respondent no.9 at this juncture has submitted that in view of there being no requirement of seeking any approval for raising a boundary wall of four feet height, the demolition undertaken by the MCD of the boundary wall raised by respondent no.9 was illegal and therefore, they may be permitted to erect the said fence at their own cost.”

4. Thus, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that raising of construction and carrying out development works is in contravention / wilful disobedience of the undertaking recorded in Paragraph 9 of the judgment / order dated 06.02.2025.

5. Issue notice.

6. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accept notice on behalf of the respondent/s.

7. Learned counsel for the respondent no.9 submits that certain demolition action was taken by the MCD pursuant to the judgment / order dated 06.02.2025.

8. Let the MCD inspect the area in question and file a status report within a period of eight weeks from today.

9. List on 17.08.2026.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MARCH 24, 2026/r