



2025:DHC:8214-DB



\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Judgment reserved on: 09.09.2025

%

Judgment delivered on: 17.09.2025

+

**LPA 533/2025, CM APPL. 51855/2025, CM APPL. 51856/2025 &
CM APPL. 51857/2025**

MAN MOHAN SINGH ATTRI

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Sachin Jain and Mr. Ajay Kr.
Agarwal, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Sanjay Katyal, Ms. Kritika Gupta,
Mr. Vidur Mohan, Ms. Harshita
Sukhija, Mr. Vidushi Singhania,
Advs. for R-2/DDA
Mr. Raghuvendra Upadhyay, Panel
Counsel with Ms. Purnima Jain, Mr.
Tanmay Jain, Advs. for R-3/GNCTD
Ms. Puja S. Kalra, S.C. with Mr.
Virendra Singh, Adv. for MCD
Mr. Amarendra Rakesh, President
RWA and Mr. Gaurav Pandey,
Secretary RWA

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

LPA 533/2025

Page 1 of 21

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SREERAM L
Signing Date: 17.09.2025
11:36:20



2025:DHC:8214-DB



J U D G M E N T

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, C.J.

1. The instant intra-Court appeal has been filed under Clause X of Letters Patent, taking exception to the judgment and order dated 23.12.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby W.P.(C.) No. 3760/ 2024 has been dismissed. The appellant has also challenged the order dated 06.08.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing the petition filed by the appellant seeking review of the judgment and order dated 23.12.2024.

2. Before advertng to the submissions made by learned counsel for the respective parties, certain facts necessary for proper adjudication of the instant intra-Court appeal are noted, which are as follows:

2.1. The Delhi Development Authority (DDA) constructed 336 flats known as Signature View Apartments initially for the use/ occupation of players and officials/ officers of the Commonwealth Games, which were held in the month of October 2010. On conclusion of the games, these flats were sold by the DDA, for which an information brochure was issued in the year 2010, inviting applications for allotment of flats.

2.2. The apartments comprised of 12 towers. Amongst others, the appellant was also allotted a flat in the said apartments, and thereafter, he has been residing with his family members in one of the flats. It appears that the flats of the said residential scheme developed cracks and started



2025:DHC:8214-DB



showing continued deterioration in their structure, as a result of which incidents of falling interior ceilings of roofs of the flats and those of falling of large lumps of exterior plaster were reported. Corrosion and rusting of the steel bars, with deterioration in the reinforced concrete, with heavy corrosion, was also reported. Accordingly, a writ petition bearing W.P.(C.) No. 14960/ 2023 was filed with the prayer to issue appropriate direction to the authorities concerned to demolish the flats and further to re-construct the flats and blocks. The other prayer made in this writ petition was that the DDA may not be allowed to construct any extra or additional flats on the existing land. Another writ petition, namely W.P.(C.) No. 6850/ 2024 was also filed challenging certain clauses of the Rehabilitation Offer Letter dated 26.06.2023 to the extent that evacuation of the respondents and demolition of the flats may be conducted only if all the residents provide a no objection certificate from a bank or financial institution regarding encumbrances on the flats and that renting/ compensation for alternate accommodation shall be admissible to the residents only after all the residents hand over the possession of the flats.

2.3. The appellant also filed W.P.(C.) No. 3760/ 2024 with the prayer for issuing a direction restraining the authorities from demolishing the Signature View Apartments without following the due process of law. Another prayer made in this petition was that the order dated 18.12.2023 passed by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (hereinafter referred to as '**the MCD**') under Section 348 and 349 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the '**DMC Act**') be quashed and further to declare



2025:DHC:8214-DB



the said order as illegal and *void ab initio*. The appellant also prayed in the said writ petition for quashing of the minutes of the meeting dated 04.08.2023, pursuant to which steps were being taken for demolishing the flats allegedly without consulting the stakeholders. A prayer was also made for issuing directions to the Central Bureau of Investigation and/ or to appoint a Judicial Committee to probe into the alleged illegal activities of the authorities in the affairs which had led to the process of demolition of the flats. The appellant also prayed that an appropriate direction be issued to the authority concerned to get the structural audit conducted by competent Government agency, and further to explore the possibility of reinforcement of the Signature View Apartments.

2.4. On certain complaints of the residents of these flats about the poor quality of construction, the DDA approached the National Council for Cement and Building Materials (hereinafter referred to as '**the NCCBM**') to undertake the work of assessment of the quality of grit wash and Reinforced Cement Concrete ('**RCC**') using Non-Destructive Evaluation Technique and for preparation of guidelines to carry out repair and remedial measures in the flats in question. Accordingly, the NCCBM undertook the assessment as requested by the DDA and submitted its report in March 2015.

2.5. In respect of Blocks A, B and C, the NCCBM in its report pointed out various lacunae/ deficiencies in the flats. Certain recommendations were also made for their repairs. In respect of Blocks D, E and F also, it was stated by NCCBM in its report that there are various deficiencies and



2025:DHC:8214-DB



lacunae in the flats relating to their structure, etc. Certain recommendations were made for their repairs as well. In respect of Blocks G, H and L, the NCCBM reported the deficiencies in the structures and recommendations were also made. So far as Blocks I, J and K are concerned, the NCCBM reported the deficiencies in the structure of the flats and made certain recommendations for their repairs.

2.6. Another report was submitted by the NCCBM on 18.02.2019, reporting cracks and spilling of cover concrete and corrosion of reinforcement in different RCC members. The NCCBM, in its report dated 18.02.2019, also expressed its opinion that, considering the distress of the blocks and existence of stilt floor, a detailed structural evaluation should be done by a structural design expert, duly taking into consideration the actual concrete strength and existing reinforcement condition. Thereafter, the Executive Engineer (ND-I/ DDA) *vide* its letter dated 18.07.2019, requested Mr. Shashank Bishnoi, Professor, IIT Delhi, to inspect the site and provide a Structural Evaluation Report. The communication dated 18.07.2019 made by the Executive Engineer of the DDA also expressed the intention of the DDA to appoint Mr. Shashank Bishnoi as Structural Consultant. The said request made by the DDA was accepted as embodied in an email communication dated 23.07.2019, sent by Mr. Shashank Bishnoi to the DDA.

2.7. Thereafter, on the agreed terms and charges which was payable to the Registrar, IIT, Delhi and in turn to the Consultant, the structural evaluation



2025:DHC:8214-DB



of 336 flats was undertaken pursuant to which a report was submitted by the consultant, namely Professor Shashank Bishnoi, Department of Civil Engineering, IIT Delhi, on 19.11.2022. The said report dated 19.11.2022, submitted by Professor Shashank Bishnoi, recommended that towers A, B and C be vacated and dismantled. It was further recommended that during the process of vacating the towers, the structures must be visually monitored periodically so as to identify any signs of acceleration of corrosion that may put the residents at risk.

2.8. Concerning towers D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K and L, Professor Shashank Bishnoi in his report recommended that these towers must be vacated as soon as possible due to the extensive deterioration that has already occurred in these towers and must be dismantled as soon as possible to prevent any loss of life.

2.9. In respect of towers D, E, I and L, it was further observed by Professor Shashank Bishnoi that these towers appear to be especially at a high risk due to which they must be vacated immediately. It was further recommended that during the process of vacating these towers, a covering must be put around the buildings to protect the passers-by from injuries due to falling pieces of concrete. The said report of the Structural Consultant, along with findings of the Testing Agency, was communicated to the Commissioner of MCD by means of a letter dated 27.01.2023 written by the Commissioner, DDA with the request to issue directions to examine the



2025:DHC:8214-DB



reports and form an opinion about the safety of the buildings and to initiate proceedings under Sections 348 and 349 of the DMC Act.

2.10. Thereafter, the order dated 18.12.2023 was passed by the Executive Engineer under Sections 348 and 349 of the DMC Act, directing the residents/ owners/ occupiers of Signature View Apartments to vacate the dangerous structures/ buildings. It was also stated in the said order that if the premises are not vacated within seven days, further appropriate action may be taken at the risk and costs of the residents/ occupiers/ owners of the flats in question. It is this order dated 18.12.2023, which was challenged by the petitioner by instituting the proceedings of W.P.(C.) No. 3760/ 2024, which has been dismissed by the learned Single Judge by means of the order dated 23.12.2024. The appellant thereafter filed a petition seeking review of the said order dated 23.12.2024 (Review Petition No. 183/ 2025), which too has been dismissed by the learned Single Judge by means of an order dated 06.08.2025. This order dismissing the review petition passed by the learned Single Judge is also under challenge herein in this appeal.

2.11. During the pendency of the writ petition filed by the appellant, an order dated 14.03.2024 was passed by the learned Single Judge directing the Union of India to file its affidavit after consultation with its structural experts and inspection of the building in question, specifying in clear terms as to whether it was possible to carry out repair work in the building in question. The learned Single Judge also directed the Union of India to specify the status of the buildings as regards its habitability, structural safety



2025:DHC:8214-DB



and as to the course of action with regard thereto. Paragraph 6 of the said order dated 14.03.2024, passed by the learned Single Judge, is relevant at this juncture, which is extracted herein below:

“6. The Union of India shall file its affidavit after consultation with its structural experts and inspection of the building in question and specify in clear terms, as to whether it is possible to carry out any repair work in the building in question. The Union of India shall also specify the status of the building as regards its habitability, structural safety and as to the course of action with regard thereto.”

2.12. In compliance of the said order dated 14.03.2024, a three-Member Committee was nominated by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India which submitted its report dated 09.04.2024 and opined that: i) it is not possible to carry out any repair work in the buildings, ii) buildings are not habitable due to significant distress observed, iii) buildings are structurally unsafe as corrosion in almost all structural members has been developed significantly.

2.13. The learned Single Judge, however, by means of the orders under challenge herein, dismissed the writ petition as also the review petition filed by the appellant.

2.14. It is these two orders dated 23.12.2024 and 06.08.2025, passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing the writ petition and the review petition, respectively, which have been questioned by instituting the proceedings of this intra-Court appeal.



2025:DHC:8214-DB



3. Adverting to the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellant, we may note that the learned counsel for the appellant has contended that Section 348 of the DMC Act vests statutory authority in the Commissioner of the Municipal Corporation for removal of dangerous buildings and since removal of any building necessarily deprives the owner/occupier of the building of certain rights available to them as such it is the Commissioner who ought to have passed the order and not his delegatee.

4. Further submission made by learned counsel for the appellant is that the language in which Section 348 is couched clearly exhibits that the order of removal of dangerous buildings can be passed only if the Commissioner forms an opinion that the building is in a ruinous condition or is likely to fall or in any way dangerous to any person occupying or is dangerous to any person resorting to or passing by such building or any other building or place in the neighborhood of such building, and accordingly, such an opinion has to be formed only by the Commissioner and not his delgatee.

5. It is also argued on behalf of the appellant that, in the instant case, the opinion that the buildings are liable to be removed under Section 348 of the DMC Act has been formed on the basis of the letter written by the DDA to the Municipal Commissioner which was based on the report of the Structural Consultant of IIT Delhi and another report of Shri Ram Institute of Industrial Research and such opinion was not formed by the authority passing the order dated 18.12.2023 on the basis of any report based on any study or structural audit conducted by the MCD. His submission is that



2025:DHC:8214-DB



Section 348 mandates forming of an opinion by the Commissioner which should be based on some study/ structural audit conducted by the officials of the MCD whereas, in the instant case, the order of removal is based on the report of external experts and the letter of the DDA as such the requirement of Section 348, while passing the order dated 18.12.2023, has not been met which vitiates the said order.

6. It is thus contended that before forming the opinion for passing the order of removal under Section 348 of the DMC Act, due diligence as expected of the authority passing the order was not observed, and therefore, the order is arbitrary, having been passed without observing the due process of law. It is also argued by learned counsel for the appellant that the report on the basis of which the DDA required the MCD to pass the order of removal under Section 348 is not by the IIT rather, by an independent professor of IIT and hence it is not reliable, and therefore, the order dated 18.12.2023, not being based on relevant report, is vitiated. Drawing our attention to a letter of the Executive Engineer, DDA, dated 06.01.2023, addressed to the President/ Secretary of Residents Welfare Association (RWA), it has been stated that even after the submission of the report by Professor Bishnoi, the matter was considered by the DDA wherein in respect of Blocks A, B and C it was opined that the condition of these Blocks seems to be good as of now and if required the work of removal of loose concrete lumps may also be taken up in these blocks. It is thus submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that, once the DDA itself expressed its opinion in respect of Blocks A, B and C repair work may be taken up after necessary



2025:DHC:8214-DB



directions are received from the competent authority of DDA, requesting an order to be passed for removal/ demolition is not sustainable.

7. The appellant has also relied upon a report dated 25.07.2024 submitted by one Mr. Yogendra Popli who has B.E. (Civil Engineering) and M.Tech (Structures) qualification to his credit, wherein on perusing the report submitted by Professor Shashank Bishnoi, Department of Civil Engineering, IIT Delhi it was opined that in the study by the expert of IIT, Delhi primary focus had been on the strength of the concrete by non-destructive testing method with the assistance of NCCBM and Shriram Institute for Industrial Research, and further that the report was silent and incomplete on the main aspect of the structural design and detailing of blocks and towers which was not scrutinized. Mr. Popli further observed that the report submitted by Professor Bishnoi did not consider the structural aspects of foundation stability of the structures.

8. It is, however, to be noticed that the said report was provided to the appellant on his personal request.

9. It is also argued on behalf of the appellant that the structural audit/ inspection conducted by the Committee constituted by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Union of India only refers to the structural evaluation report submitted by Professor Bishnoi in November, 2022 and also on the visual inspection of the 12 Blocks, and therefore, no independent structural audit was conducted by the said Committee which is in violation of the order dated 14.03.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge whereby



2025:DHC:8214-DB



the Union of India was required to file its affidavit after consultation with its Structural Experts and inspection of the building in question.

10. It is the submission of the appellant that the aforesaid aspects of the matter have not been considered by the learned Single Judge, and therefore, the order whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant was dismissed is not sustainable.

11. It has further been contended that even in the review petition, the said aspects have completely been ignored, and hence the order passed in the review petition is also liable to be set aside. Apart from praying that the orders under challenge herein may be set aside, learned counsel for the appellant has prayed that, having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, a direction may be issued to conduct a fresh structural audit, and only thereafter, it may be ordered that appropriate decision regarding the removal of the flats in question may be taken.

12. Learned counsel representing the DDA and MCD have opposed the appeal in unison and have submitted that the learned Single Judge has rightly returned the findings while passing the impugned orders that the scope of judicial review in examining the reports of experts is very limited and that once the experts have expressed their opinions that buildings are not safe for human habitation, it is neither possible nor permissible for a writ Court to express any otherwise opinion. It has also been argued on their behalf that the order for removal of buildings, dated 18.12.2023 has been passed on the basis of the material available in the form of reports of the



2025:DHC:8214-DB



experts and the appropriate authority has formed its opinion under Section 348 of the DMC Act on the basis of tangible and relevant material, and therefore, there is no illegality in the orders passed by the learned Single Judge which are challenged herein and hence no interference is warranted to be made by the Court in this intra-Court appeal.

13. It is also submitted that the petitioner is not denying the fact that the order dated 18.12.2023 though has not been passed by the Commissioner of the MCD, but it has been passed by his delegate under due delegation of powers, and accordingly, merely because the order dated 18.12.2023 has not been passed by the Commissioner himself, the same will not be vitiated in any manner.

14. Further submission made on behalf of the respondents – DDA and MCD is that an order of removal under Section 348 of the DMC Act has to be based on subjective satisfaction of the authority concerned on the basis of the material available, which in the instant case, did exist in the form of reports submitted by the experts, and therefore, no illegality can be attributed to the said order. The submission, thus, is that the learned Single Judge has rightly dismissed the writ petition as also the review petition filed by the appellant.

15. Having given our consideration to the respective submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, we are of the opinion that the learned Single Judge has taken a correct view of the matter and has rightly refused to interfere in the order dated 18.12.2023, giving detailed reasons and



2025:DHC:8214-DB



relying on the legal principles governing the exercise of powers under Section 348 of the DMC Act.

16. At this juncture itself, we may first note that it is not the case of the appellant that the authority which has passed the order was not having due delegation of powers to be exercised under Section 348 for passing an order of removal of the buildings in question.

17. Merely because the Commissioner has not passed the order of removal of buildings; rather, it has been passed by his delegate, in our considered opinion, it will not make the order without jurisdiction or vitiated. It is to be further noticed that Section 348 empowers the authority concerned to pass an order of removal on his forming an opinion that the building is in ruinous condition or is likely to fall or it has become dangerous to the persons occupying the same or persons resorting to or passing-by such buildings. Section 348 of the DMC Act runs as under:

“348. Removal of dangerous buildings

(1) If it appears to the Commissioner at any time that any building is in a ruinous condition, or likely to fall, or in any way dangerous to any person occupying, resorting to or passing by such building or any other building or place in the neighbourhood of such building, the Commissioner may, by order in writing, require the owner or occupier of such building to demolish, secure or repair such building or do one or more of such things within such period as may be specified in the order, so as to prevent all cause of danger therefrom.

(2) The Commissioner may also, if he thinks fit, require such owner or occupier by the said order either forthwith or before proceeding to demolish, secure or repair the building, to set up a proper and sufficient



2025:DHC:8214-DB



hoard or fence for the protection of passers-by and other persons, with a convenient platform and handrail wherever practicable to serve as a foot-way for passengers outside of such board or fence.

(3) If it appears to the Commissioner that danger from a building which is in a ruinous condition or likely to fall is imminent, he may, before making the order aforesaid, fence off, demolish, secure or repair the said building or take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the danger.

(4) If the owner or occupier of the building does not comply with the order within the period specified therein, the Commissioner shall take such steps in relation to the building as to prevent all cause of danger therefrom.

(5) All expenses incurred by the Commissioner in relation to any building under this section shall be recoverable from the owner or occupier thereof as an arrear of tax under this Act. ”

18. A perusal of the afore-quoted provision of Section 348 reveals that the Commissioner or his delegatee can pass the order of removal of dangerous buildings upon his satisfaction that such building is in ruinous condition or is likely to fall or has become dangerous. Such satisfaction is to be based on relevant material. As observed above, in the instant case, the material on the basis of which the order of removal of buildings has been passed is based on the reports of experts, which included the report by an expert from IIT, Delhi as also the test report regarding materials submitted by Shri Ram Institute of Industrial Research. These materials, in our opinion, are germane to forming an opinion for fulfilling the requirement of Section 348 of the DMC Act.

19. So far as the submission made by learned counsel for the appellant that the report has not been submitted by the IIT Delhi, rather, it is by an individual professor, it is to be noticed that the competence of a professor of



2025:DHC:8214-DB



IIT, Delhi, that too, in civil engineering, cannot be doubted. Further, the Consultant, namely Professor Shashank Bishnoi may have charged the consultation fee, it was remitted through the IIT, Delhi and, therefore, the submission in this regard made by learned counsel for the appellant merits rejection.

20. It has also been argued on behalf of the appellant that for forming an opinion under Section 348 of the DMC Act, the MCD ought to have relied upon some report relating to structural audit, etc., on the basis of a study to be conducted by its own officers/ experts and not on the letter written by the IIT, Delhi. This submission, in our opinion, also lacks merit and does not improve the case of the appellant for the reason that for forming an opinion under Section 348 of the DMC Act, the source of relevant material is not relevant; what is relevant is that the material relied upon for forming such an opinion needs to be germane to forming the opinion that the building in question is in a ruinous condition or has become dangerous. Such an opinion by the competent authority under Section 348 of the DMC Act can be formed based on any material gathered by the authority, not necessarily from its own officers or experts.

21. Reliance placed by learned counsel for the appellant on the report submitted by the private expert, namely Mr. Yogendra Popli, is also not tenable for the reason that the said report dated 25.07.2024, is only a comment on the report submitted by Professor Shashank Bishnoi from IIT,



2025:DHC:8214-DB



Delhi. The said report is not based on a structural audit or any kind of survey or inspection.

22. The submission on behalf of the appellant that the report of the Committee of Experts formed by the Union of India, dated 09.04.2024, is irrelevant is not acceptable for the reason that the said committee also comprised of experts which submitted its report based on the structural evaluation of the apartments done by the expert from IIT, Delhi. It is also to be noticed that apart from going through the structural evaluation report submitted by Professor Shashank Bishnoi of IIT, Delhi, the members of the Committee themselves had carried out a visual inspection of the 12 Blocks of Signature View Apartments.

23. On the submission that the report of the Committee, dated 09.04.2024, needs to be discarded for the reason that it is based only on visual inspection of the building, we may observe that, by the said logic, the report submitted by Mr. Popli, dated 25.07.2024, will also have to be discarded. In any case, the satisfaction that the buildings have become ruinous and unsafe for human habitation, as is reflected from the order dated 18.12.2023, is formed on the basis of relevant material available before the authority concerned who has passed the order under Section 348 of the DMC Act and such reports were prepared by experts after conducting a thorough enquiry, inspection, certain laboratory tests etc.



2025:DHC:8214-DB



24. In the aforesaid view, we do not find the view taken by the learned Single Judge in any manner erroneous that the reports of the domain experts cannot be commented upon.

25. If we peruse the orders passed by the learned Single Judge which are under challenge herein, what we find is that the learned Single Judge has considered various reports and has returned a finding that the buildings in question are structurally unsafe and further that repair works undertaken by the DDA had proved to be cosmetic since very structure of the building was found to be fundamentally weak.

26. It has also been observed by the learned Single Judge that the Lieutenant Governor, Delhi, has also endorsed the reports of the experts and has approved the recommendations of the experts that the building in question ought to be demolished and re-constructed.

27. The learned Single Judge has placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Union of India and Others Versus J.D. Suryavanshi***, (2011) 13 SCC 167 wherein it has been held that in a situation where technical questions arise and experts of the field have expressed their views and all those aspects have been taken into consideration by the Government in deciding a matter, interference in exercise of powers of judicial review will not be permissible.

28. Relying upon the judgment in ***National Board of Examination Versus Association of MD Physicians***, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2362, the



2025:DHC:8214-DB



learned Single Judge has opined that if a decision taken by a public authority is a plausible view, only because another view is possible, it is not a ground for interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and further that the opinion of experts cannot be supplanted by a Court.

29. ***Municipal Corporation of Delhi Versus Daulat Ram (Died) Represented by L.Rs.***, 1971 SCC OnLine Del 130 has also been relied upon by the learned Single Judge wherein appropriate meaning to Section 348(1) has been assigned, according to which, the issue arising thereunder is not between two private parties rather, it is between a public authority and the individual affected by administrative action. In ***Municipal Corporation of Delhi (supra)***, it has also been held by this Court that the law does not place the public authority and the individual on the same footing and that Section 348(1) confers a statutory discretion on the Commissioner. Further observation in this judgment is that such discretion is to decide whether any building is in a ruinous condition and such question is of public interest and is not a matter only of the private interest of its owner or its tenant. The Court further observes that, that is the reason why the power is given to the Commissioner to form the opinion whether the building is in a ruinous condition or not and accordingly by giving this power exclusively to the Commissioner, the Legislature has correspondingly withdrawn the question whether the building is in a ruinous condition or not from the jurisdiction of the Courts. The Court has further observed that if the existence of the conditions or grounds on which such an opinion could be formed is proved



2025:DHC:8214-DB



then the Courts cannot go further and enquire whether the grounds or the conditions were sufficient to support the opinion.

30. Thus, we are in complete agreement with the findings recorded by the learned Single Judge in the orders under challenge herein for the reason that the discretion under Section 348 of the DMC Act is to be exercised by the competent authority based on the relevant material, sufficiency of which cannot be gone into by the Courts. What is to be seen while judicially scrutinizing such decisions is as to whether the authority competent to exercise such discretion has relied upon relevant material or not. In the instant case, as already noted above, the opinion of the competent authority while passing the order under Section 348 is based on the opinion and recommendation made by the experts which are based on a thorough study from the point of view of a Civil Engineer and, accordingly, it cannot even remotely be said that while passing the order dated 18.12.2023, the competent authority has not based his opinion or satisfaction on relevant material. In the facts of the case, it cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be said that there was no relevant material before the authority that passed the order dated 18.12.2023 for removal of the buildings. Various reports of investigation by the Structural Consultants and findings of the testing agency were placed before the authority concerned who on consideration of the said material formed his opinion as per the requirement of Section 348 of the DMC Act and thereafter has passed the order for demolition of the buildings in question.



2025:DHC:8214-DB



31. For the reasons aforesaid, we do not find any good ground to interfere in the orders passed by the learned Single Judge which are under challenge in this intra-Court appeal, which accordingly fails.
32. Resultantly, the appeal is hereby dismissed.
33. However, there shall be no orders as to costs.

(DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(TUSHAR RAO GEDELA)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 17 , 2025

N.Khanna

LPA 533/2025

Page 21 of 21

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: SREERAM L
Signing Date: 17.09.2025
11:36:20