



\$~57

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

CNR No. DLHC010443232026

+ **W.P.(C) 13664/2026&CM APPL. 63827/2026**

QADEEMI MASJID THROUGH ITS CARETAKING

COMMITTEE

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Salman Khurshid, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Ibad Mushtaq, Mr. Fuzail Ahmad
Ayyubi, Ms. Akanksha Rai, Ms.
Gurneet Kaur, Ms. Sidra Khan, Ms.
Alvina Ali, Ms, Dikshita & Ms.
Mariya Mansuri, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma ASG Mr. Nishant
Gautam CGSC Mr. Vanshul Pali GP
Mr. Amit Gupta Adv. Ms. Kavya
Shukla Adv. Mr. Kartik Khullar Adv.
Mr. Vineet Negi Adv. Mr. Vibhav V.
Nath Adv. Mr. Shubham Sharma
Adv. Mr. Naman Adv. Ms. Nandini
Singh Adv. Officer Present: Mr. Ravi
Teja EE, CPWD Mr. Akash, L&DO
for R-1 & 3

Mr Saurabh Seth, Standing Counsel
along with Mr Jitendra Kumar
Tripathi, ASC NDMC with Mr
Abhiroop Rathore Mr Kabir Dev and
Mr Sukhvir Singh, Advs. for
R-2/NDMC

Ms. Farhat Jahan Rehmani ASC, Ms.
Fatima Parveen, Ms. Muskan Ali,
Ms.Tasneem Parveen & Ms. Diya
Keswani, Advocates for R-4/DWB



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

17.09.2026

%

1. The present Writ Petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

- (i) *Issue a writ, in the nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, order or direction restraining the Respondent Nos.1 to 3 from demolishing, dismantling, removing or otherwise disturbing the waqf Property/Qadeemi Masjid situated within the compound of Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi, without first undertaking a fair, transparent and reasoned consideration of its continued retention*
- (ii) *Issue and appropriate Writ, Order or Direction, directing the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to consider the feasibility of retaining the Qadeemi Masjid at its existing location while implementing the Central Vista Redevelopment Project;*
- (iii) *In the alternative, in the event the Respondents establish that retention of the Qadeemi Masjid at its existing location is genuinely unavoidable or incompatible with the approved redevelopment, direct the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to provide a reasonable, proximate and adequate alternative prayer facility for the same.*

2. *Mr. Salman Khurshid, Senior Advocate, appears for the petitioners, and fairly states that they are not seeking stalling of any redevelopment project of Krishi Bhavan and Shastri Bhavan, where the said Qadeemi Masjid exists, i.e. within the compound of Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi, as planned by the Central Government, but seek a prayer facility in the newly envisaged structures, since the Qadeemi Masjid has been serving as a place of offering prayers, for government employees and other working in the*



surrounding government offices for several decades.

3. *Mr. Khurshid*, Senior Advocate, states that they seek a reasonable and proximate arrangement ensuring continuity of the prayer facility, as permitted in terms of Article 25 of the Constitution of India. Additionally, he contends that *Qadeemi Masjid* is a structure of considerable antiquity and has been in existence for more than a century. Its existence predates the establishment of the present government complex and is documented by various historical records, going as back as 1945.

4. In 1970, the Delhi Waqf Board notified the property as Waqf property and recorded its antiquity. Even when *Krishi Bhavan*, *Shastri Bhavan* and surrounding government offices were constructed in 1950s and 60s, the *Qadeemi Masjid* continued to remain in existence and was used by Muslim employees working in the said the offices for offering prayers.

5. *Mr. Khurshid*, Senior Advocate, therefore, contends, that the petitioners, who are caretakers of the said Masjid, as also some employees who offer prayers in the said Masjid, are conscious that the land underneath is a government property. The immediate apprehension is of the petitioners is with respect to the ongoing redevelopment, which has commenced and proposes dismantling of the existing complex.

6. *Mr. Khurshid*, Senior Advocate, submits that *paragraph 26* of the present writ petition specifically states that they have no objection to the *Central Vista Redevelopment Project* and do not any seek any suspension or delay in the construction of the Common Secretariat Buildings. The petition is, therefore, confined to the treatment of *Qadeemi Masjid* and the consequences that the same might have on its established users.

7. Issue notice.

8. Notice is accepted by *Mr. Nishant Gautam*, Central Government



Standing Counsel [**‘CGSC’**], who appears on behalf of the Union of India, respondent nos.1 and 3; *Mr Saurabh Seth*, Standing Counsel for the New Delhi Municipal Corporation [**‘NDMC’**]/respondent no.2; and *Ms. Farhat Jahan Rehmani*, Additional Standing Counsel [**‘ASC’**] for Delhi Waqf Board/respondent no.4.

9. *Mr. Chetan Sharma*, Additional Solicitor General [**‘ASG’**], is present on behalf of the Union of India, and states that he shall take instructions with respect to the issue raised herein and file a response/status report in this regard, by the next date of hearing.

10. Response/status report shall be filed by the respondents, within a period of four weeks, with an advance copy to the counsel for petitioner.

11. List on 02nd November 2026.

12. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2026/sm/ya