

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I.A.NO. 229 IN W.P.(C) No.13029/1985

M.C. MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

Respondent(s)

( appln.for directions arising out of C.P.No.01/2002)

WITH

I.A.NO.227 IN W.P.(C) No.13029/1985

(appln. for directions arising out of C.P.NO.259/2000)

WITH

I.A.NO.230 IN W.P.(C)NO.13029/1985

(Appln. for directions arising out of C.P.No.413/2003)

WITH

I.A.NO.253-254 IN W.P.(C) No.13029/1985

(appln. for impleadment and directions)

W I T H

I.A. NO.269 IN W.P.(C) No.13029/1985

(Appln. for directions on behalf of MCD)

Date: 12/10/2007 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE ARIJIT PASAYAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.H. KAPADIA

For the Parties:Mr. Kuldeep Singh Tomar(In-Person)

Mr. Harish N. Salve, Sr. Adv. (A.C.)

Mr. U.U. Lalit, Sr. Adv. (A.C.)

Mr. Praveen Swarup, Adv.

NDMCMr. Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Sr.Adv.

Dr. Rashmi Khanna, Adv.

Mr. Surya Kant, Adv.

Mr.Ashok Bhan,Adv.

Mrs. Varuna Bhandari Gugnani, Adv.

Mr.S.Wasim A.Qadri,Adv.

Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.

Ms. Anil Katiyar, Adv.

Mr. S.W.A. Qadiri,Adv.

Mr. Pavan Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Subramonium Prasad, Adv.

Mr. Sanjiv Sen, Adv.

MCDMr. Praveen Swarup, Adv.

Mr. Subhash Bansal, Adv.

Ms. Vijayalakshmi Menon, Adv.

Mr. S.N. Terdal, Adv.

Mr.V.K. Tankha, Sr. Adv.  
IA 253-254Mr. Prashant Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Anurag Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Vishnu B.Saharya, Adv.  
DDAfor M/s. Saharya & Co.Advs.

Mr. M.C. Mehta, Adv.

For HSIDCMr. Ravindra Bana, Adv.

IA 22Mrs. Sheel Sethi, Adv.

Mr. R.N. Karanjawala, Adv.  
Ms. Nandini Gore, Adv.  
Mr. Debmalya Banerjee, Adv.  
Ms. Sonia Nigam, Adv.  
for Tata Motors Ltd.Ms. Manik Karanjawala, Adv.

St of ManipurKh. Nobin Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Tarun Jamwal, Adv.

DTCMs. A. Subhashini, Adv.

CPCBMr. Vijay Panjwani, Adv.

Mr. Shri Narain, Adv.  
SIAMMr. Sandeep Narain, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Pursuant to the order passed by this Court, the Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control) Authority for the National Capital Region has prepared a report regarding the Outdoor Advertisement Policy. The matter was examined in detail and report has been submitted before us. The various parameters have been laid down as to how the bill-boards hoardings can be fixed the city roads within the jurisdiction of the M.C.D. Certain objections have been raised by some persons who who intend to file applications i.e. those who have put up hoardings in the roof top of their house or buildings. They contended that these hoardings were permitted to be put under the earlier policy and if this proposed policy is implemented, they will not be allowed to put hoardings on their buildings and this would cause serious prejudice to them by the implementation of the policy. If any such persons are aggrieved by the implementation of the proposed policies, they would be at liberty to challenge the same. MCD would be at liberty to go ahead with the policy and the persons who feel aggrieved may file appropriate application before this Court and appropriate orders would be passed. The MCD may go ahead with the implementation of the policy, notwithstanding any order passed by any court.

(SHEETAL DHINGRA)(NEERU BALA VIJ)  
COURT MASTER COURT MASTER