



\$~5, 43 to 47

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1342/2025, CM APPL. 55680/2025

(5) SMT ANJALI ANR & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sonal Sorda, Ms. Sunidhi Gupta,
Ms. Tanvi Mehta, Advs.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ORS.Respondent

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan (Sr. Adv.)
along with Ms. Meenakshi, Adv. for
R1/DUSIB
Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv. (Panel
Counsel) for GNCTD
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Ms. Deeksha
L. Kakar, Mr. Aditya Verma, Mr.
Rashneet Singh, Ms. Kavya Shukla,
Advs. for DDA

+ W.P.(C) 6817/2025, CM APPLs. 30909/2025, 32144/2025

(43) SMT MOOTHU WALI & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Ms. Rupali Samuel, Ms. Aditi Soni,
Advs.

versus

DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT BOARD (DUSIB)
THROUGH THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER & ORS.

....Respondent

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan (Sr. Adv.)
along with Ms. Meenakshi, Adv. for
R1/DUSIB
Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv. (Panel
Counsel) for GNCTD
Mr. Anuj Chaturvedi, Ms. Richa
Dhawan, Ms. Shivani Thakur, Advs.
for DUSIB
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Ms. Deeksha
L. Kakar, Mr. Aditya Verma, Mr.
Rashneet Singh, Ms. Kavya Shukla,
Advs. for DDA



+ W.P.(C) 7699/2025, CM APPL. 34198/2025

(44) SMT ANJALI & ANR.

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sonal Sarda, Ms. Sunidhi Gupta,
Ms. Tanvi Mehta, Advs.

versus

DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT BOARD & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan (Sr. Adv.)
along with Ms. Meenakshi, Adv. for
R1/DUSIB
Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv. (Panel
Counsel) for GNCTD
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Ms. Deeksha
L. Kakar, Mr. Aditya Verma, Mr.
Rashneet Singh, Ms. Kavya Shukla,
Advs. for DDA

+ W.P.(C) 7782/2025, CM APPL. 34412/2025

(45) P KANNAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Deeksha Dwivedi, Adv.
versus

DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT BOARD (DUSIB)
THROUGH THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan (Sr. Adv.)
along with Ms. Meenakshi, Adv. for
R1/DUSIB
Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv. (Panel
Counsel) for GNCTD
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Ms. Deeksha
L. Kakar, Mr. Aditya Verma, Mr.
Rashneet Singh, Ms. Kavya Shukla,
Advs. for DDA

+ W.P.(C) 7965/2025, CM APPL. 34987/2025

(46) CHANDRAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Rupali Samud, Ms. Prasanna.S.,
Ms. Injila Muslim Zaidi, Mr.
Prasanna.B, Ms. Aditi Soni, Advs.



versus
DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT BOARD AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan (Sr. Adv.)
along with Ms. Meenakshi, Adv. for
R1/DUSIB
Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv. (Panel
Counsel) for GNCTD
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Ms. Deeksha
L. Kakar, Mr. Aditya Verma, Mr.
Rashneet Singh, Ms. Kavya Shukla,
Advs. for DDA

+ W.P.(C) 8269/2025, CM APPLs. 36049/2025, 36050/2025
(47) MALA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Deeksha Dwivedi, Adv.
versus

DELHI URBAN SHELTER IMPROVEMENT BOARD (DUSIB)
THROUGH THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Parvinder Chauhan (Sr. Adv.)
along with Ms. Meenakshi, Adv. for
R1/DUSIB
Mr. Parvinder Chauhan (Sr. Adv.)
along with Ms. Meenakshi, Adv. for
R1/DUSIB
Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv. (Panel
Counsel) for GNCTD
Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Ms. Deeksha
L. Kakar, Mr. Aditya Verma, Mr.
Rashneet Singh, Ms. Kavya Shukla,
Advs. for DDA

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER
26.09.2025

%

1. It appears that the directions in interim order dated 29.05.2025 passed



by this Court to the effect that provisional demand-cum-allotment letters be issued to petitioners, have not been complied with.

2. Learned counsel for the DDA/respondent no. 1 submits that the same is on account of the fact that the requisite amounts have not been paid by the PWD/respondent no. 3. The same is, however, refuted by learned counsel for the petitioners, who point out that in the order dated 28.03.2025 passed by the Division Bench of this Court, it was recorded as under:-

“12. It is further submitted by Ms. Grover, that out of the 370 Jhuggi Jhopdi families, 189 have been found to be eligible and 182 have been found to be ineligible. She states that out of the said 182 ineligible dwellers to her knowledge 84 dwellers, as per her instructions, have filed an appeal. She states that out of these 84 appeals, 70 appeals still remain pending. According to Ms. Grover, the exact status of the pending 70 appeals can be verified from the DUSIB. In this regard, it is her submission that if the draw of lots for 189 eligible Jhuggi Jhopdi dwellers is conducted tomorrow, the Court ought to ensure that the remaining 182 dwellers, whose appeals may be filed before DUSIB, should not be left unadjudicated and the rights of the said dwellers if they succeed should be protected.

13. It is further urged that the next concern is about facilities pertaining to transportation and schools for the persons/children who are being rehabilitated, in the proposed neighbourhood of Narela.

14. Upon a query from the Court about the availability of funds for rehabilitation, Ms. Kaur, Id. Counsel for DDA submits that the money, to the tune of approximately Rs.27 crores, has been received from the PWD. As per the affidavit filed by DUSIB dated 9th November, 2024, the exact status of the said amount is as under:

*“Provisional relocation charges to DUSIB in respect of **318** jhuggi households at Rs.8,64,100/- amounting to Rs.27,47,83,800/-.”*

15. The above amount is stated to have been deposited by PWD with the DDA. It is relevant to note that DUSIB’s affidavit clarifies that the amount deposited covers rehabilitation costs for 318 Jhuggi Jhopdi Dwellers.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners points out that from the aforesaid



observations of the Division Bench of this Court, it is apparent that the amount of Rs. 27 crores were paid by the Public Works Department (PWD)/respondent no.2, that would suffice for as many as 318 Jhuggi Households. It is a matter of record that the number of provisional demand-cum-allotment letter issued by the DDA/respondent no. 3 thus far, are only 189 in number. As, such it is contended that sufficient funds have already been paid by the PWD to enable the DDA to issue provisional demand-cum-allotment letters to the petitioners.

4. Quite apart from the above, even assuming there is some controversy inter-se the respondents as regards the sufficiency of the amount paid/deposited by the PWD, the same does not afford any justification for non-compliance. It is incumbent on the respondents to resolve the same and comply with the interim directions. *Prima facie*, the respondents are collectively in wilful disobedience of the orders passed by this Court.

5. Before passing further orders, it is directed that a meeting be convened between (i) Director (Housing-PMUDAY/DDA) (ii) senior officials of Delhi Urban Shelter Improvement Board (DUSIB)/respondent no. 1 and (iii) the concerned Chief Engineer of PWD, within a period of two weeks from today to resolve the matter and to make sure that the orders passed by this Court are complied with.

6. In case, the same is not done, the Court shall be constrained to take appropriate actions against the concerned respondents for committing wilful disobedience of the orders passed by this Court.

7. Let a copy of this order be sent to the Chief Engineer (PWD/GNCTD), and also through the concerned standing counsel. The Chief Engineer, PWD, GNCTD is directed to coordinate and convene the



aforesaid meeting to resolve the matter.

8. List on 11.11.2025.

SACHIN DATTA, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/uk