



\$~8

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4439/2025**

JAI PRAKASH

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI MCD
& ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kannopriya Gupta, Advocate
for R-1/MCD
Ms. Urvi Mohan & Ms. Mahika
Bisht, Advocates for R-3, 4 & 5.
Mr. Kameshwar Nath Mishra, Senior
Panel Counsel for R-6.
Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma and
Mr. Puneet Yadav, Advocates for
DDA
Mr. Ajjay Arora, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Vansh Luthra, Advocate for
owner/occupier, Faisal Hamid
Mr. V.P. Rana, Mr. Aviral Jain and
Mr. Aryaman Singh, Advocates for
applicant/Mr. Ved Pal

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

**ORDER
27.07.2026**

%

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



- a. Direct the Respondent No. 2, 3, 4 & 6 to conduct a demarcation in respect of the Khasra No. 203/1, 203/2 and 207 situated in Village Aya Nagar, Tehsil Mehrauli, Delhi 110017.
 - b. Directing the Respondent No. 1 & 2 to demolish the illegal and unauthorized construction on Khasra No. 203/1, 203/2 and 207 situated in Village Aya Nagar, Tehsil Mehrauli, Delhi 110017.
 - c. Direct the Respondent No. 3 to initiate the ejectment proceedings against the Land grabbers in respect of the Khasra No. 203/1 situated in Village Aya Nagar, Tehsil Mehrauli, Delhi 110017.
 - d. Issue appropriate writ, order or directions in nature of mandamus directing the demolition of illegal and unlawful construction from the forest land.
2. Various status reports have been filed on behalf of respondent-MCD wherein it is stated that the averments made in the writ petition are vague and the petitioner has not provided specific details of the properties against which unauthorised construction has been alleged.
3. The petitioner has only provided Khasra numbers and not the details of the property.
4. It is evident from the prayers set out above that the petitioner has sought demarcation in respect of Khasra No. 203/1, 203/2 and 207 situated in Village Aya Nagar, Tehsil Mehrauli, Delhi 110017 and therefore, the petitioner is not himself clear about the properties.
5. The petitioner has also failed to implead the owner(s) of the various properties mentioned in the writ petition.
6. In the latest status report filed on behalf of the respondent-MCD



pursuant to the order passed by this Court on 27th March, 2026, it is stated that the petitioner resides three kilometres away from the subject property.

7. In the status report filed on behalf of SHO, Vasant Kunj, respondent no.6, it is stated that the petitioner herein has made 73 PCR calls alleging illegal construction, property takeover, other disputes and the sheer volume of complaints along with allegations of blackmailing raises concerns about the intent of the complaints made by the petitioner.

8. None appears on behalf of petitioners.

9. In light of the averments made in the status report this Court is not inclined to entertain the present writ petition.

10. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

AMIT BANSAL, J

JULY 27, 2026
ds