



\$~51

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3878/2026 & CM APPL. 19047/2026**

**APEX CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
OF NCT DELHI**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Dubey, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Vivek Kumar
Tandon, Mr. Sah Rukh Khan and
Ms. Laxmi Gupta, Advocates

versus

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI &
ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Kapil Dutta, Standing Counsel
for MCD

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

**ORDER
25.03.2026**

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:-



- a. Quash and set aside the Show Cause Notices dated 18.12.2025 in respect to property bearing Nos. A-14/1, A-14/2 and A-14/3, Naraina Industrial Area, Phase 2, New Delhi and further any coercive action taken in pursuance to the said Show Cause Notice. More particularly, sealing of the property without providing Resolution No. 56 dated 20.07.2022 as mentioned in the circular dated 22.07.2022.
- b. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction thereby quashing and setting aside the circular bearing No. Addl. Comm. (B) HQ/MCD/2022/D-025 dated 22.07.2022, issued by Respondent No.1, to the extent it levies infrastructure up-gradation charges of Rs. 5,000/- per sq. mtr. without disclosure of the underlying Decision/Resolution and supporting material;
- c. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction thereby directing the Respondents to furnish the Decision/Resolution No. 56 dated 20.07.2022, along with the minutes of the meeting, justification, methodology, and all documents forming the basis of the impugned circular;
- d. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction thereby restraining the Respondents from taking any coercive action against the Petitioner for non-payment of the infrastructure up-gradation charges, till such time the relevant documents and justification for the levy are disclosed;

2. The petitioner association is aggrieved by the action of the respondents/MCD in not providing resolution No. 56 dated 20th July 2022,



despite repeated requests made by the petitioner.

3. Mr. Kapil Dutta, appearing on behalf of respondents/MCD, objects to the maintainability of the present petition as the writ petition has been filed by the petitioner association instead of the individual noticees, to whom the show cause notices were issued.

4. Nevertheless, Mr Kapil Dutta has handed over a copy of the resolution No.56 dated 20th July, 2022, to counsel for the petitioner in Court today.

5. In view thereof, Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Dubey, senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, submits that the petitioner be given one week's time to file an additional reply to the impugned show cause notice issued by the respondent/MCD.

5.1. Accordingly, the petitioner is given one (1) week to file reply.

6. Upon receipt of the reply, respondents/MCD shall pass a speaking order.

7. The present writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

8. Needless to state that the petitioner shall be entitled to take appropriate remedies available in law if the petitioner is aggrieved by the speaking order.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MARCH 25, 2026
ds