$~87

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010550932026**

\+ CONT.CAS(C) 2107/2026

SUDHIR BANSAL .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. A.K Mishra, Advocate.

versus

MUNCIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS. ....Respondents

Through: Counsel for Respondents (appearance not given)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

O R D E R

% 19.11.2026

CM APPL. 79263/2026 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. The Application stands disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 2107/2026

3. Contempt Petition under Article 215 of the Constitution of India read with Sections 2(b) and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, has been filed for wilful disobedience of the Order dated 21.10.2024 in W.P.(C) No. 14744/2024, whereby the learned counsel for the MCD had stated that on inspection of the suit property, construction was found to be ongoing. A Stop Work Notice had been issued on 15.10.2024 and the construction has since been sought. The MCD was directed to maintain a vigil over the property to ensure that no unauthorised construction takes place and in the event, any unauthorised construction is raised, action as per law, be taken expeditiously and in any event within six weeks.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 23/11/2026 at 22:10:48

4. Learned Counsel for the MCD had appeared and stated that there was no construction activity going on as on date and that the requisite information has been given to the SHO to ensure that no construction takes place, till further Orders. In view of the aforesaid, the Petition was disposed of as not pressed, but liberty was given to the Petitioner to revive the Contempt Petition in case of any violation of the Order dated 21.10.2024 in future.

5. The Petitioner had filed CONT. CAS (C) NO. 155/2025 alleging violation of the directions given, vide Order dated 21.10.2024.

6. The Petitioner submits that after removal of the unauthorised structure, fresh construction activity has commenced again on the subject land. It is not a mere technical or inconsequential irregularity, but necessitates judicial intervention. Fresh construction has commenced on 17.10.2026. The photographs taken by the Petitioner on 19.10.2026 are annexed in support thereof.

7. It is further alleged that Mr. Sumit Bhatia and Mr. Rohit Bhatia have been threatening the Petitioner on the mobile phone as being the associate of the persons, who are undertaking the construction, with consequences if he objected to or reported the activity.

8. The Petitioner also approached the police authority including SHO, PS Laxmi Nagar on 19.10.2026 and brought to the notice of the directions of this Court, as well as, the renewed activity at the subject site. Another Complaint dated 22.10.2026 along with the photographs and video, has been made by the Petitioner.

9. It is, therefore, submitted that in view of the initiated unauthorised construction, the wilful disobedience of the Order dated 21.10.2024 of this

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 23/11/2026 at 22:10:48

Court has been committed and the Respondents may accordingly, be directed to remove all the unauthorised construction including the tin shed installed around the plot and to restore it to its original number.

10. **Learned counsel for the MCD** has appeared on advance Notice and submitted that there is no unauthorised construction being carried out on the subject plot and a strong vigil is being maintained, to ensure that no unauthorised construction comes up on the plot. It is further explained that the tin scaffolding has been erected around the empty plot, in terms of GRAP-II that has been imposed. It is further stated that the Respondents shall ensure that no unauthorised constructions ever comes up on the suit plot, in terms of the Order dated 21.10.2024.

11. Learned counsel for the Respondent No. 2/SHO on instructions, states that as on date, there is no unauthorised construction being carried out on the plot.

12. In view of the aforesaid and also considering the photographs annexed by the Petitioner, it is evident that as on date, there is no unauthorised construction being carried. Mere erection of tin sheets to cover the plot, cannot be termed as unauthorized construction. Therefore, no further action is merited on the present Contempt Petition.

13. The Contempt Petition is disposed of, accordingly.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

NOVEMBER 19, 2026/RS

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 23/11/2026 at 22:10:48