



\$~50 to 55, 58, 60 & 61

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

+ W.P.(C) 590/2006, CM APPL. 504/2006 (Stay), CM APPL. 505/2006 (For Appearance for Pleading), CM APPL. 2626/2006 (For Direction), CM APPL. 7614/2006 (For Direction), CM APPL. 12124/2008 (For Direction), CM APPL. 26223/2017 (For Direction) & CM APPL. 55436/2019 (For Modification of order dt. 05.12.2019)

SOCIETY FOR SAFE STRUCTURESPetitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Advs.

versus

U.O.I & ORS

....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sriharna Chatterjee, SC
with Mr. Vikrant Pachnanda,
ASC and Mr. Mukul Katyal,
Adv. for NDMC.

Ms. Shobhana Takiar, SC, Mr.
Prateek Dhir, Mr. Shivam
Takiar and Mr. Kuljeet Singh,
Advs. for DDA.

Ms. Puja S. Kalra, SC for
MCD.

Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Advs. for UOI.

Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC with Mr.
Shivam, Adv. for MCD.

51

+ W.P.(C) 7861/2010

CAMPAIGN FOR PEOPLE PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Advs.

versus

UOI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Avni Singh, Adv. for
GNCTD.



Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC with Mr.
Shivam, Adv. for MCD.

52

+ W.P.(C) 7862/2010

H.R. SURI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Advs.

versus

UOI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Advs. for UOI.

Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC with Mr.
Shivam, Adv. for MCD.

53

+ W.P.(C) 1547/2011

CAMPAIGN FOR PEOPLE PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Advs.

versus

UOI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avni Singh, Adv. for
GNCTD.

Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Advs. for UOI.

54

+ W.P.(C) 4012/2012

CAMPAIGN FOR PEOPLE PARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

...Respondents

Through: Ms. Puja S. Kalra, SC for



MCD.

Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Adv. for UOI.

55

+ W.P.(C) 4034/2012

CAMPAIGN FOR PEOPLE PAPARTICIPATION IN
DEVELOPMENT PLANNINGPetitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Adv.

versus

UNIION OF INDIA AND ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Adv. for UOI.

58

+ W.P.(C) 938/2012

H.R. SURIPetitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIARespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Uniyal with Mr.
Dhawal Uniyal and Ms.Vibhuti
Bhatt, Adv. for UOI.

Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC for
DDA.

Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Adv. for UOI.

Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC with Mr.
Shivam, Adv. for MCD.

60

+ W.P.(C) 5514/2017 & CM APPL. 23202/2017 (Stay)

CAMPAIGN FOR PEOPLE PARTICIPATIONPetitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.



Madan Mohan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avni Singh, Adv. for
GNCTD.

Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj,
CGSC with Mr. Kushagra
Kumar, Mr. Abhinav Bhardwaj
and Mr. Amit Kumar Rana,
Advs. For R-1.

Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Advs. for UOI.

61

+ W.P.(C) 9193/2021, CM APPL. 28646/2021 (Interim
Injunction) & CM APPL. 54180/2023 (To Restrain the
Respondent)

DAVINDRA MAHEY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anil K. Aggarwal and Prof.
Madan Mohan, Advs.

versus

COMMISSIONER SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Siddhant Nath, SC, Mr.
Bhavishya Makhija and Mr.
Amaan Khan, Advs. for MCD.
Mr. Bhagvan Swarop Shukla,
CGSC with Mr. Sarvan Kumar,
Advs. for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHWANT VARMA

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

ORDER

27.02.2025

%

1. Having heard preliminary submissions which were addressed
by learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner and on going



through the reliefs which are claimed in W.P.(C) 590/2006 and W.P. (C) 4034/2012, we find that the writ petitions principally question the constitutional validity of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 and the Delhi Jal Board Act, 1998. We, however, find that no consequential reliefs have either been sought or claimed in those writ petitions.

2. The question which would thus consequently arise would be whether the declaration as sought is liable to be considered to be granted.

3. In view of the aforesaid, and in order to enable learned counsel for the petitioner to take the same under advisement, including whether the writ petitioner proposes to pursue these petitions in public interest, if it could be said to arise, let the matters be re-notified for 01.04.2025.

YASHWANT VARMA, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
FEBRUARY 27, 2025/nd