OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
NEW DELHI DISTRICT, PATIALA HOUSE COURTS, NEW DELHI

CIRCULAR

In compliance of the directions of the Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge, New Delhi District, PHC, New Delhi, regarding Order dated 20-05-2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Miscellaneous Applicaton Diary no. 17103 of 2026 in SLP (Civil) No. 8044-8045 of 2025 titled " Longanathan Vs The State of Tamil Nadu and Ors" has been uploaded on the official website i.e. newdelhi.dcourts.gov.in.

Therefore, it is requested to kindly peruse the abovesaid Order dated 20-05-2026 from the official website for kind information & necessary compliance.

(Deepali Sharma)
Officer-in Charge, General Branch
District Judge, Commericial Court -03
New Delhi District, PHC, New Delhi.

No. 2231-2236 /Genl./NDD/PHC/2026 Dated, Delhi the 25/7/2026

Copy to :-

1. The Ld. Registrar General Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, New Delhi for information.
2. All the Ld. Judicial Officers at PHC, New Delhi.
3. Ld. Officer-in Charge, Computer Branch, PHC, New Delhi with the request to direct the concerned official to upload the same on the website of New Delhi District Courts as per rules.
4. P.S to the Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge, NDD, PHC, New Delhi for information.
5. Administrative Officer (Judicial), PHC, to circulate the aforesaid judgment through WhatsApp. Group of Ld. Judicial Officers of New Delhi District.
6. Dealing Assistant, R & I Branch for uploading the same on LAYERS.

Officer-in Charge, General Branch
District Judge, Commericial Court -03
New Delhi District, PHC, New Delhi.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION Diary NO. 17103 OF 2026

LOGANATHAN **Petitioner(s)**

VERSUS

THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU & ORS. **Respondent(s)**

O R D E R

Heard Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, learned Amicus Curiae.

2. At the outset, learned Amicus submitted that he has received affidavits only from three States. Even with regard to the affidavits which have been served on him, it is stated that they merely highlight the results of the exercise undertaken on the ground pursuant to the order of this Court dated 25.03.2026, for verifying the use/misuse of land by the persons in possession of such properties. Learned Amicus submitted that there is not even a whisper in any of the affidavits as to what action has been taken by the authorities after having been made aware of such blatant violations and transgressions of the statutory provisions as well as the specific directions issued by the Courts, including this Court in its judgment dated 17.12.2024 in Civil Appeal No. 14604 of 2024 and Civil Appeal No. 14605 of 2024 [*Rajendra Kumar Barjatya and another v. U.P. Avas Evam Vikas Parishad & Ors. and Rajeev Gupta and Others v. U.P. Avas Evam Vikas Parishad & Ors.* respectively].

3. Learned Amicus further submitted that from the issue which has now surfaced on the basis of the limited material placed before this Court through the affidavits filed by various municipalities and corporations, the problem appears to be enormous and the scale of violations staggering. By way of illustration, he submitted that even in the national capital, i.e., Delhi, in areas like Lajpat Nagar and Sarojini Nagar, violations are of such magnitude that there exists a serious threat of a major mishap or calamity. According to him, buildings have been constructed far beyond the sanctioned plans, with deviations exceeding the condonable limits and in blatant violation of the building bye-laws. There are innumerable structures where permission was granted only for construction up to two storeys, whereas the actual construction is far in excess thereof. Such structures are inherently unsafe as the foundations are not designed to bear the additional load. Considering the high footfall in these areas, he submitted that a calamity is only waiting to happen.

4. Upon a query being put to the learned senior counsel appearing for the Municipal Corporation of Delhi, regarding the aforesaid issue, the response was that multiple usages are permissible under the Master Plan. We are not satisfied with such a stand. The Master Plan may permit multiple uses; however, once a person opts for a particular use and obtains sanction of the building plan from the competent authority for that specific purpose, any subsequent change of user is wholly impermissible and amounts to nothing short of a fraud on the system. This aspect appears to have been

completely glossed over by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi and may even indicate tacit collusion and connivance with the violators for extraneous considerations, which are neither difficult to comprehend nor unknown.

5. Be that as it may, this Court is convinced that some drastic action is required in the matter. We are conscious of the fact that in such cases, a statutory remedy is ordinarily available to the person against whom action is initiated. However, by approaching the statutory or quasi-judicial authorities, which may be known by different nomenclatures, including appellate authorities under the relevant enactments, proceedings remain pending for long periods despite statutory timelines prescribed for their disposal. The situation becomes even more complicated when further proceedings are instituted before the High Courts, where such matters often remain pending for years.

6. Having regard to the picture that has emerged and the submissions advanced by the learned Amicus, we issue the following directions for the present:

(i) All the respondents shall file fresh affidavits indicating the actual action taken pursuant to the surveys conducted by them. Such affidavits shall be personally affirmed by the head of the concerned authority, viz., Chairman, Chairperson, Chief Executive Officer, or by whatever designation such officer may be known. The affidavits shall reflect effective action taken on the ground and not a mere ritualistic compliance. We clarify that by "follow up action", we mean immediate and effective measures, including

sealing, demolition, or any other action warranted in law, particularly in conformity with the judgment of this Court in *Rajendra Kumar Barjatya* (supra). The nature and extent of such action shall be specifically disclosed in the affidavits. The concerned officers are cautioned to be truthful not only to this Court but also to themselves while discharging the statutory obligations attached to their offices.

(ii) The statutory appellate authorities and quasi-judicial forums dealing with matters relating to violations of building norms, unauthorized constructions, change of land use and allied issues shall ensure that all such cases pending before them are disposed of, as far as possible, within a period of three months from today. Any unwarranted deviation therefrom may render the concerned authority answerable to this Court if such violation is brought to its notice or otherwise comes to its knowledge.

(iii) While filing their affidavits, the respondents shall also take note of the judgment of this Court in *Rajendra Kumar Barjatya* (supra) and the directions issued therein, and shall ensure strict compliance thereof, particularly at the initial stage itself.

(iv) It has been brought to our notice that the New Okhla Industrial Development Authority (NOIDA), the Greater Noida Industrial Development Authority (GNIDA), the Gurugram Metropolitan Development Authority, the Ghaziabad Municipal Corporation and the Faridabad Municipal Corporation operate within the National Capital Region (NCR). Similarly, the Bidhannagar Municipal Corporation,

Salt Lake City, West Bengal, is also required to be heard in the present proceedings. Accordingly, notice shall be issued to all of them along with a copy of this order so that they may apprise themselves of the exercise required to be undertaken in the present matter.

7. In view of the emerging scenario, we also deem it necessary to implead the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India through its Secretary, as a party respondent.

8. We are conscious that the task entrusted to the learned Amicus is herculean. Accordingly, we permit him to avail the assistance of one Advocate-on-Record, namely, Mr. Govind Jee, Advocate (AoR Code No. 3275), and two learned counsel, namely Mr. Naveen Soni, Advocate, and Mr. Akshat Agarwal, Advocate.

9. We make it clear that the learned Amicus shall function as the Nodal Officer in the present proceedings for all purposes, including the receipt and examination of grievances submitted by private citizens or bodies in relation to the issues involved herein.

10. Since every State and Union Territory is involved in the present matter and there appear to be widespread, serious and glaring violations, some of which have already been brought on record, we deem it appropriate that the costs of these proceedings be borne collectively by all States and Union Territories. Accordingly, each State and Union Territory shall deposit a sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) with the Registry of this Court within a period of two weeks from today.

11. Out of the aforesaid corpus, a sum of Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs) shall, for the present, be released by way of demand draft in favour of Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, learned Amicus Curiae, towards the secretarial expenses incurred in the present matter. Such payment shall be made within one week from the date of receipt of the deposits.

12. At this stage, learned Amicus drew our attention to the further affidavit filed by Ms. Kakarla Usha, Additional Chief Secretary to the Government, Housing and Urban Development Department, State of Tamil Nadu. Learned Amicus took us through various paragraphs of the said affidavit. Prima facie, the affidavit appears to be more in defence of the petitioner than reflective of the objective and responsible position expected from a senior public officer in proceedings of this nature. The affidavit also indicates a casual approach towards the orders passed by this Court.

13. Our prima facie view is fortified by the fact that though this Court had initially granted an order of interim stay in favour of the petitioner, the Special Leave Petition came to be dismissed on 16.02.2026. Consequently, from that date onwards, no interim protection was operating. Yet, the structure continues to remain intact without any consequential action having been taken. This circumstance prima facie suggests connivance. The affidavit filed by the Additional Chief Secretary is shocking and reflects a blatant disregard for the rule of law, coupled with a bold attempt to shield the petitioner. In our considered view, the officer is

required to explain her conduct.

14. Accordingly, she is directed to remain personally present before this Court on the next date of hearing along with a show-cause response explaining why appropriate proceedings should not be initiated against her for the aforesaid conduct.

15. Learned counsel appearing for the State of Tamil Nadu shall communicate this order forthwith to the said Additional Chief Secretary for compliance.

16. Learned Amicus further pointed out that the Jaipur Development Authority has neither entered appearance nor filed any affidavit. He submitted that he has received numerous complaints from residents of Jaipur alleging serious violations. At this juncture, we clarify our earlier order and observe that the concerned authority shall not take shelter behind the plea that, instead of the authority itself, the Municipal Corporation has erroneously been impleaded. It is the authority responsible for town planning, sanction of building plans, enforcement of building bye-laws and regulation of land use that is required to respond in the present proceedings.

17. A complaint received in the present matter shall be forwarded to the learned Amicus for examination and appropriate action.

18. Before parting, we take note of the Office Report dated 19.05.2026 indicating that service is complete upon all respondents except the authority at Bengaluru, where notice was reportedly refused. We are unable to comprehend the reason for such refusal.

Since the same has been recorded in the Office Report, we direct the Commissioner, Greater Bengaluru Authority (Respondent No. 20), to submit a personal explanation in that regard.

19. List the matter on 04.08.2026 at 02.00 p.m. as part-heard.

20. We make it clear that if, by the next date of hearing, any respondent, including those newly impleaded today, fails to file an affidavit duly sworn by the head of the concerned authority, such officer shall remain personally present before this Court along with a show-cause response.

21. We further clarify that if, on the next date, any respondent remains unrepresented or fails to appear personally in compliance with this order and without a satisfactory explanation, this Court may proceed to issue notice for initiation of contempt proceedings against such respondent(s).

.....J.
(AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH)

.....J.
(R. MAHADEVAN)

NEW DELHI
MAY 20, 2026.

ITEM NO.64 COURT NO.13 SECTION XII

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

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION Diary No.17103/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 18-02-2026 in SLP(C) No. No. 8044/2025 passed by the Supreme Court of India]

LOGANATHAN Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU Respondent(s)

Date : 20-05-2026 This petition was called for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Purnima Krishna, AoR

Mr. N. Rajaraman, AoR
Mr. Lakshmanan R, Adv.
Ms. Sweety Jacklin K, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Ms. G. Indira, AoR

Ms. Purnima Krishna, AoR
Mr. M.F. Philip, Adv.
Mr. Karamveer Singh Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Togin M. Babichen, Adv.

Mr. K. V. Mohan, AoR

Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AoR
Ms. Prerna Singh, Adv.
Ms. Vanshika Singh, Adv.

Ms. Eliza Barr, Adv.
Ms. Akansha, AoR
Ms. Anjali Saxena, Adv.

Mr. Manish Kumar, AoR
Mr. Divyansh Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Kumar Saurav, Adv.

Ms. Nidhi Mittal, AoR
Mr. Tirupati Gaurav Shahi, Adv.

Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AoR
Mr. Mayank Sapra, Adv.
Mr. Karun Shamra, Adv.
Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.
Ms. Rajkumari Divyasana, Adv.

Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AoR
Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Adv.
Ms. Chubalemla Chang, Adv.
Mr. Prang Newmai, Adv.
Ms. Yanmi Phazang, Adv.

Mr. Hitendra Nath Rath, AoR
Mr. Niranjan Moharana, Adv.
Mr. Amitabh Panda, Adv.
Ms. Laxmi, Adv.

Ms. Devina Sehgal, AoR
Mr. Srikanth Varma Mudunuru, Adv.
Mr. Yatharth Kansal, Adv.

Mr. Kunal Chatterji, AoR
Ms. Maitrayee Banerjee, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Bansal, Adv.
Mr. Varij Nayan Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Sanjiv Sen, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Praveen Swarup, AoR
Mr. Prahalad Balaji, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Swarup, Adv.
Mr. Devesh Maurya, Adv.
Ms. Jama Singh, Adv.
Mr. Praharsh Chaudhary, Adv.
Ms. Ashu Tomar, Adv.
Ms. Sakshi, Adv.
Ms. Jharna Singh, Adv.

Mr. Akshay Verma, AoR
Mr. Udit, Adv.
Mr. Munesh Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Rajneesh Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Huzefa Ahmadi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shoeb Alam, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Daksh Kadian, Adv.
Mr. Khalid Ali, Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Purohit, Adv.
Mr. Aashray Chopra, Adv.
Mr. Rohan Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Rashmi Singh, Adv.
Mr. Manohar Pratap, AoR

Mr. Purushottam Sharma Tripathi, AoR
Mr. Prakhar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Sameer Abhyankar, AoR
Mr. Aakash Thakur, Adv.

Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, AoR
Mr. T.K. Nayak, Adv.
Mr. Z. H. Isaac Haiding, Adv.
Mr. Marbiang Khongwith, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Yashraj Singh Bundela, AoR
Mr. Surjeet Singh GA Pawan, Adv.

Mr. Anup Kumar Rattan, Adv.
Mr. Kartikeya Rastogi, Adv.
Mr. Inderdeep Kaur Raina, Adv.
Ms. Tamanna Kavdia, Adv.
Mr. Anurag Sahay, AoR

Mr. H.K. Chaturvedi, AoR
Mr. Sagan Chaturvedi, Adv.

O R D E R

List the matter on 04.08.2026 at 02.00 p.m. as part-heard, in terms of the signed order.

(KRITIKA TIWARI)
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(ANJALI PANWAR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(signed order is placed on file)