



\$~24 &25

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 821/2019 and CM APPL.52768/2024

ANJELI VAID

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Aakanksha Kaul, Mr. Aman Sahani, Ms. Ashima Chopra and Mr. Saptarshi Sarmah, Advs.

versus

MR. RAKESH KUMAR & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel Counsel, Civil and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Adv. GNCTD.

Mr. Kushagra Kumar, SPC for Delhi Police.

Mr. Deepak Pathak, Adv. for R-3 / BSES RPL (through v/c)

+ W.P.(C) 9239/2019

ANJELI VAID

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Aakanksha Kaul, Mr. Aman Sahani, Ms. Ashima Chopra and Mr. Saptarshi Sarmah, Advs.

versus

GOVT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI

THROUGH ITS STANDING COUNSEL & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel Counsel, Civil and Mr. Siddharth Arora, Adv. GNCTD.

Mr. Kushagra Kumar, SPC for Delhi Police.

Mr. Deepak Pathak, Adv. for R-3 / BSES RPL (through v/c)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

25.03.2026

1. The petitioner claims to be the owner of khasra no.623, situated in Revenue Estate of Village Maidan Garhi, Tehsil Mehrauli, New Delhi



comprising of 01 bighas 13 biswas land.

2. Protective orders were passed in favour of the petitioner in the present proceedings when the petition came to be initially filed. *Vide* order dated 26.08.2019, it was specifically directed that status quo shall be maintained in respect of the parcel of land which is the subject matter of the sale deed dated 27.12.1999 in favour of the petitioner.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that in flagrant contempt of the aforesaid order, demolition action was carried out *qua* the premises of the petitioner.

4. It is further the case of the petitioner that inconsistent explanations have been given by the respondents seeking to somehow justify the flagrant disobedience of orders passed by this Court. It is submitted that the explanations have been offered by way of affidavits filed from time to time, which are wholly contradictory to each other.

5. In the above circumstances, the petitioner seeks that appropriate action be taken against the concerned officials for committing wilful disobedience / contempt of orders passed by this Court and also seeks that appropriate compensation be awarded to the petitioner. In this regard, the petitioner relies upon a judgment titled as ***Kangana Ranaut vs. Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai & Ors.***, 2020 SCC OnLine Bom 3132.

6. Independent of the aspect of contempt, the moot question in the writ petition is whether the petitioner's premises fall within Khasra No. 623 or under some other khasra.

7. According to the respondents, the petitioner's premises fall within khasra no. 624 and not khasra no. 623. It is their case that the action in question was taken in respect of khasra no. 624 and not khasra no. 623.

8. The material on record does not clearly disclose how demarcation of



the khasras was carried out. The demarcated khasras have also not been physically earmarked.

9. This Court is of the view that it would be apposite to undertake a fresh demarcation exercise to clearly identify khasra nos. 623 and 624 and to physically identify the same on the ground.

10. Let a fresh demarcation and identification exercise be conducted by the officials of the respondents, together with the aid and assistance of the petitioner.

11. Let the fresh demarcation report be placed on record before the next date of hearing.

12. List on 28.07.2026.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MARCH 25, 2026/cl