IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
30.

W.P.(C) No. 9358 of 2006

JANGPURA RESIDENTS WELFARE ASSOCIATION ..... Petitioner
Through: Mr. R.K. Saini and Mr. Nikhil Bhalla, Advocates.

versus

LT. GOVERNOR OF DELHI and ORS. ... Respondents
Through: Mr. Rajiv Bansal, Advocate for DDA.
Ms. Amita Gupta, Advocate for MCD.
Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, Advocate for GNCTD.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR

O R D E R
09.07.2008

W.P.(C) No. 9358 of 2006 and C.M. Nos. 10762, 12162, 13614, 13984/2006, 325/2007(directions) and 9252 of 2008(directions)

1. This petition by the Jungpura Residents Welfare Association was filed on 25th May 2006 seeking, inter alia, the removal of unauthorised constructions and encroachments by Jungpura clusters at the public land and bed of the Nalla alongside the Jungpura residential colony and to restore it as a green area.

2. Pursuant to the directions issued by the Court, the Respondent Municipal Corporation of Delhi has been filing status reports. The status report dated

30th July 2007 shows that the de-silting of the Nalla was completed in June 2007. The encroachments had been removed and the land had been developed. An estimate had been made for construction of a boundary wall to ensure that no encroachment is made in future. Trees were planted on the bed of Nalla.

3. An application was subsequently filed on 7th July 2008 by the Petitioner for a direction to the Respondents to remove all other structures including a mosque. Photographs of the said structures have been enclosed with the application.

4. Having examined the photographs, it appears to this Court that most of the unauthorised structures have been removed and there is a boundary wall constructed to ensure that no further encroachments take place. It is stated by the counsel for the Respondents that any further grievance that the Petitioner may have, including those made in the present application, will be promptly

looked into and appropriate action will be taken thereon. In view of this statement, this Court does not consider it necessary to continue to monitor the progress of the implementation of its directions.

5. The petition and applications are accordingly disposed of.

CHIEF JUSTICE

S. MURALIDHAR, J
JULY 09, 2008
dn
W.P.(C) No. 9358 of 2006 Page 2 of 2