

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPLE BENCH, NEW DELHI
APPEAL NO. 15 of 2025**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Vasant Kunj RWA, Sector-B, Pocket-1

...Appellant

-Versus-

Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change & Ors.

...Respondents

INDEX**NDoH:28.10.2025**

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
1.	Rejoinder on behalf of Appellant to the Reply dated 26.06.2025 filed by Respondent No. 6, Department of Forest and Wildlife, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi alongwith Affidavit.	2476-2487
2.	<u>ANNEXURE A/1:</u> - True copy of the letter dated 13.09.2024	2488-2489
3.	<u>ANNEXURE A/2:</u> - True copy of the Restraintment Order dated 17.09.2024	2490-2491
4.	Proof of Service	2492

Date: 27.10.2025

Place: New Delhi

DRAWN & FILED BY:

Mansi Bachani, Gitanjali Sanyal & Surya Gupta

Advocates for the Appellant

29, LGF, Presidential Estate

Nizamuddin East, New Delhi 110013

Email: eldflegal@gmail.com +91- 8851323704**SETTLED BY:**Mr. Sanjay Upadhyay
[Senior Advocate]

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPLE BENCH, NEW DELHI
APPEAL NO. 15 of 2025**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Vasant Kunj RWA, Sector-B, Pocket-1

...Appellant

-Versus-

Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change & Ors.

...Respondents

**REJOINDER ON BEHALF OF APPELLANT TO THE REPLY DATED
26.06.2025 OF RESPONDENT NO. 6, DEPARTMENT OF FOREST AND
WILDLIFE, GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY
OF DELHI**

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH: -

1. That the present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant challenging the Environmental Clearance dated 13.01.2025 (hereinafter "EC") obtained by the Respondent No. 5, RR Texknit LLP for constructing a Group Housing Project at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-1, Vasant Kunj. The said EC has been obtained based on a plagiarized and misleading Environment Impact Assessment Report, while deliberately suppressing crucial facts about the project, including non-obtainment of requisite statutory clearances by the Respondent No. 5, undertaking tree felling based on forged tree felling permission and existence of a wetland/pond in the vicinity of the project, among others.
2. That on 21.02.2025, this Hon'ble Tribunal was please to issue Notice to the Respondents. Subsequently, the Appellant filed IA No. 451/2025 dated 01.07.2025 bringing on record additional evidence to substantiate non-compliance of the law by the Respondent No. 5.
3. That on 02.07.2025, Respondent No. 6 Department of Forest & Wildlife, Government of NCT of Delhi filed its Reply. Subsequently, this Hon'ble Tribunal, vide Order dated 03.07.2025, directed Respondent No. 6 to cure the defects in its

said Reply and directed the Appellant to file its Rejoinder. Accordingly, the present Rejoinder to the Reply is being filed.

4. That at the outset, the Appellant vehemently refutes all the allegations and averments raised by the Respondent No. 6 as false, frivolous and fanciful as if traversed seriatim, and no allegation/averment would be deemed to be admitted for want of a specific denial. The Appellant further seeks to submit some Preliminary Submissions before providing the paragraph-wise response, for a holistic adjudication of the matter.

PRELIMINARY SUBMISSIONS

5. That the Respondent No. 6 has falsely alleged that the Appellant has indulged in forum shopping by raising the same grievances through multiple proceedings before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court and the Central Empowered Committee (hereinafter "CEC") and that the issues raised in the Appeal already stand conclusively adjudicated. The said allegation is absolutely baseless and fanciful as the proceedings before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Hon'ble Delhi High and the CEC are based on distinct causes of action and do not involve a challenge to the Environment Clearance of the Respondent No. 5. More importantly, the issues raised in other foras do not come within the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Tribunal as they do not pertain to the enactments mentioned in the Schedule to the National Green Tribunal Act, 2010 (hereinafter "**NGT Act, 2010**"). Some residents and other third parties had also filed petitions before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court, on their own accord, and on issues that do not come directly under the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Tribunal and without consulting the Appellant herein, which represents the cause of the entire community living in Sector B. The details of each proceeding that has been constituted before different forums are as below: -

PROCEEDINGS INSTITUTED BEFORE THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT, HON'BLE DELHI COURT AND THE HON'BLE CENTRAL EMPOWERED COMMITTEE ARE BASED ON A DISTINCT CAUSE OF ACTION AND DO NOT AMOUNT TO FORUM SHOPPING

Details of Proceedings before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court

6. That the Appellant had filed W.P. (C) No. 11283 of 2024 before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court challenging the Sanction dated 13.05.2024 granted by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi to the Respondent No. 5 for developing the project. The said issue was not raised before this Hon'ble Tribunal as it does not constitute a substantial question relating to the environment, and the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957, under which the said sanction has been granted, is not specified in Schedule I of the NGT Act, 2010.
7. That CM Application No. 52907 and 52908 of 2024 in CONTEMPT CASE (C) No. 1149 OF 2024 were filed by the Appellant **against** the illegal felling of trees by the Respondent No. 5 without obtaining necessary permission under the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994. The said matter was disposed of on 06.12.2024 (i.e., much before the institution of the present Appeal) with a direction to ensure the maintenance and health of 19 trees and restrict any further felling of trees. It is submitted that this issue raised before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court under the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994, is not mentioned in the Schedule to the NGT Act, 2010 and therefore not strictly within this Hon'ble Tribunal's jurisdiction. Moreover, the present Appeal is a statutory Appeal and the only forum for such a first Appeal is this Hon'ble Tribunal.
8. That subsequently, CMA No. 5956 of 2025 was filed in the above CONTEMPT CASE (C) No. 1149 OF 2024 seeking recall and clarification of the Order dated 06.12.2024 as the Status Report dated 19.09.2024, which, revealed glaring violations of tree felling by Respondent no. 5 and contains contradictory statements with respect to the Report dated 04.10.2024 of the DCF on the same issue, was not

brought to the notice of the Hon'ble Court. Notice has been issued in the matter, and the matter is pending consideration.

9. That WP No. 352 of 2025 was filed by one of the residents of B-1 without discussing or consulting with the Appellant. The said Writ Petition was dismissed by the Single Judge Bench on 20.01.2025 in view of the pendency of a similar Writ Petition of RWA before the High Court, and the said Order was upheld by the Division Bench on 07.02.2025. However, liberty was granted to take recourse to legal remedies depending upon the outcome of the CEC proceedings.

Details of the Proceedings before the Ld. CENTRAL EMPOWERED COMMITTEE

10. That in October 2024, Mr Rajeev Ranjan, before becoming the President of the Resident Welfare Association, had preferred an Application No. 1587 of 2024 before the Ld. CEC raising objections against the proposed project of the Appellant, as the project was falling within the Morphological Ridge area and therefore, no construction could be allowed without clearance from the Ridge Management Board.
11. That on 26.10.2024, the Appellant also submitted a Letter Petition to the Ridge Management Board (hereinafter "RMB") against the commencement of construction in the morphological ridge. A copy of the letter dated 26.10.2024 is annexed at Annexure A/1, Page 2424 of Rejoinder dated 27.09.2025 to Reply of Respondent No. 5.
12. That on 24.03.2025, the RMB issued a letter to the CEC, in response to the CEC letter dated 25.02.2025, stating that Respondent no. 5 had not sought approval from the Board for its project. The Board also expressed its inability to provide any further views on the matter, although incorrectly, in light of the Order dated 16.05.2024 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Bindu Kapurea v. Subashish Panda (Contempt Petition (Diary No.) 21171/2024 in W.P.(C) No. 4677/1985). It is significant to note that while considering the EC application of Respondent No. 5, the Expert Appraisal Committee, in its 134th Meeting held on 29.11.2024 had explicitly observed that for

further clarity of project area being in morphological ridge, it is desired that the Respondent No. 5 may seek clarification from the Ridge Management Board and based on the clarification, NOC may be obtained. However, it is evident from the Board's letter dated 24.03.2025 that the Respondent No. 5 did not comply with the said condition before obtaining EC. A copy of the letter dated 24.03.2025 is annexed at Page 2269 of the Reply dated 02.07.2025 of Respondent No. 6.

13. That the CEC submitted its Report No. 25 of 2025 dated 14.05.2025 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, wherein it categorically noted that the submission of Mr Ranjan is correct as 80% of the project falls in the 'Morphological Area'. However, the CEC recommended that the project be subject to strict compliance with conditions relating to tree plantation, restriction on felling of trees, remedial measures for waste management and a quarterly compliance report to the CEC. The Ld. CEC had also recommended that all conditions imposed while granting Environmental Clearance should be strictly adhered to. Significantly, the issue of Environmental Clearance, more particularly plagiarized EIA Report, was not raised before the Ld. CEC.

Details of Proceedings before the Hon'ble Supreme Court

14. That a Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 57901/2024 in W.P. (C) No. 4677/1985 has been preferred by one Ms. Bhavreen Kandhari contending violation of the Order dated 09.05.1996 passed in W.P. (C) No. 4677/1985 whereby the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed that all the encroachments be removed from the ridge area and mandated its continued protection and maintenance. Notice was issued by the Hon'ble Court against the alleged contemnors, and the matter is pending consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court .
15. That on 12.08.2025, the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered and accepted the recommendations of the CEC, subject to strict compliance with the conditions imposed by the CEC. Significantly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court also observed that in case it is found that the project proponent has committed a crime with regard to felling of trees, the law would take its own course. It is important to note that the Hon'ble

Supreme Court is the court of first Appeal from any order of this Hon'ble Tribunal in Statutory Appeals as well as Original Applications.

16. That in view of the above, it is evident that the above proceedings that are pending before the Hon'ble High Court, Ld. CEC and the Hon'ble Supreme Court are based on entirely separate causes of action. These proceedings do not involve a challenge to the EC dated 13.01.2025 of the Respondent No. 5, and even the prayers sought in these proceedings are distinct from the prayers in the present Appeal. The Respondent No. 6 has misled this Hon'ble Tribunal by contending that the issues raised in the present Appeal have already been conclusively adjudicated by the Ld. CEC, even though the challenge to the EC was never raised before the Ld. CEC, Hon'ble Delhi High Court or Supreme Court, which is a statutory right of any aggrieved person as defined under Section 18 of the NGT Act, 2010.

17. That, more importantly, the Appellant has always made full and bona fide disclosure of the litigations pending before other forums in its pleadings, including the present Appeal. Had the Appellant indulged in re-agitating the same grievances, notices would not have been issued in these matters. Rather, this multiplicity of the proceedings points to the fact that the Respondent No. 5 has been developing its project without obtaining the requisite clearances, forging tree clearance permissions, submitting a misleading Environment Impact Assessment Report, while the regulatory authorities, including the Respondent No. 6, have turned a blind eye to all these illegalities.

PARA WISE REPLY

18. That the contents of Paragraph 1 and 2 are denied as baseless and incorrect, and reliance is placed on the Preliminary submissions. In particular, it is submitted that the Appellant has been constrained to initiate proceedings since the Respondent No. 5 is developing its project, in gross defiance of the environmental norms, and which is negatively impacting the quality of life of 5000 residents who are residing

in the immediate vicinity of the project. It is also reiterated that the proceedings that have been initiated before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the High Court are based on a completely distinct cause of action, and the issue of EC is not sub-judice before any forum. It is also submitted that the Respondent No. 6 has failed to effectively discharge its statutory duties and this is evident from the letters from Deputy Conservator of Forest, West Forest Division to the Station House Officer, Vasant Kunj noting that fake permission for tree felling has been issued and requesting to register an FIR.

19. That in response to the content of paragraphs 3 and 4, it is submitted that the proceedings before the Ld. CEC were largely concerned with the issues of the exact nature of the subject land (viz. - morphological ridge, reserve forest and protected forest) and whether vegetation had been cut or removed without adequate clearances. As noted above, the issue of EC was neither raised nor considered or determined by the Ld. CEC. On the contrary, pursuant to the Report of the CEC No. 25/2025, the Respondent no. 5 was compelled to admit that the site indeed falls within the morphological ridge area requiring mandatory clearances. Such a contradictory stand reflects a case of deliberate suppression of material facts on the part of the Respondents. It is also worth noting that in Reply dated 18.07.2025 filed on behalf of Principal Secretary, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi in Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 57901/2024, it has been clearly admitted that various tree offences have been committed by the Respondent including forging signature of Deputy Conservator of Forest (West) on draft permission for tree felling. There is also a gross discrepancy in the reported number of trees in the Status Report dated 23.10.2024 and 19.09.2024 listing 23 and 38 trees, while the Respondent No. 5 mentioned 11 trees in Form 1 [Refer, Para 7.22, Pg. 39 & A/2, Pg. 88 of the Appeal] and 19 trees in the EIA Report. In particular, a letter dated 13.09.2024 issued by the Deputy Conservator of Forest (South) to the Station House Officer, Vasant Kunj, clearly notes that illegal cutting of trees has

been carried out without obtaining permission from the competent authority. True copy of the letter dated 13.09.2024 is annexed herewith as **ANNEXURE A/1**.

20. That with respect to the contents of paragraphs 5 and 6, it is submitted that since the inception of the project, there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of the Respondent No. 5 to conceal and obfuscate the facts regarding the morphological ridge status of the project land. In Form 1A and submissions to the EAC, the Respondent No. 5 had categorically denied that the project site was located on a morphological ridge area and claimed that no forest clearance was required. This itself is a ground for setting aside the Impugned EC. Further, after the Report of the CEC No. 25/2025, the Project Proponent was compelled to admit that the site indeed falls within the morphological ridge area requiring mandatory clearances. It is also pertinent to note that while the Hon'ble Supreme Court had restrained Ridge Management Board from *considering proposals* for diversion of ridge without prior permission (vide Order dated 16.05.2024 in Contempt Petition (Diary No.) 21171/2024 in W.P.(C) No. 4677/1985), there was no bar on Respondent No. 5 in seeking clarification from the Board regarding the precise morphological ridge status of the project. The submission regarding the subject land not being part of the notified ridge is also misplaced because the Hon'ble Supreme Court has categorically held that lands situated outside the notified Ridge Areas but having morphological features conforming to the ridge should be given the same protection as is given to the notified areas. It is also important to reiterate that such morphological ridge needs forest clearance. And only after Stage I Clearance, any EC can be granted to the project that contains forest-like areas, such as the morphological ridge. This again is a single ground for setting aside the impugned EC.

21. That the contents of Paragraphs 7 and 8 are denied. At the outset, it is submitted that the Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 57901/2024 in W.P. (C) No. 4677/1985 was preferred by one Ms. Bhavreen Kandhari and not the Appellant

herein. Therefore, the Respondent No. 6 is deliberately trying to mislead this Hon'ble Tribunal by submitting that the proceedings before the Hon'ble Supreme Court are being pursued by the Appellant. Further, as already noted above, the issue of EC has not been raised before any other forum, including the Hon'ble Supreme Court and reliance is placed on the preliminary submissions raised above.

22. That the contents of Paragraphs 9 – 14 are admitted to the extent they form a matter of record, and the rest are denied. It is denied that the Appellant has made false and baseless allegations regarding a discrepancy in the Status reports dated 19.09.2023 and 23.10.2024 filed before the Hon'ble High Court. It is submitted that there have been confirmed reports of forgery, and the Respondent No. 5 has gone to the extent of colluding with some of the government authorities, leading to contradictory reports and forged permissions. The first case of unauthorized tree felling was observed by and reported in the Inspection Report of the Range Officer dated 13.09.2024, wherein it was noted that inspection of the subject property was carried out pursuant to a complaint and upon inspection, it was found that illegal cutting of a tree had been done without obtaining permission of the competent authority. Accordingly, the officer requested the Station House Officer, Vasant Kunj, to file an FIR for the offence committed under the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1995. Consequently, a Restraintment Order dated 17.09.2024 was issued directing to stop any work that may damage trees and environment. True copy of the Restraintment Order dated 17.09.2024 is marked and annexed herewith as **ANNEXURE A/2**.

That further, letters have also been issued by the Deputy Conservator of Forest, West Forest Division wherein it has been categorically noted that fake permission for tree felling have been issued. On 13.12.2024 Deputy Conservator of Forest, West Forest Division wrote to Station House Officer, Vasant Kunj for registering a complaint regarding forgery of government documents, which has been recovered from one Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma. Another letter was written by the DCF West Division, on 06.03.2025, to the Deputy Conservator of Forest (P&M),

Department of Forest and Wildlife, stating that fake permission has been issued for tree felling/transplantation/pruning in the name of this office. The Station House Officer, Police Station, Vasant Kunj has been directed to take cognizance of the issue and register FIR under Section 173 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Samhita. Department of Forest and Wildlife, Delhi, in the case of Const. Petition (C) Diary No. 57901/2024 in W.P. (C) No. 4677/1985 has also submitted an Affidavit dated 10.07.2025 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, clearly stating that the said permissions are forged and requisite action has been initiated against the Respondent No. 5. Therefore, there is considerable force in the submission of the Appellant that there is discrepancy in the number of trees recorded in the reports. Letters dated 13.12.2024 and 06.03.2025 are annexed as Annexure A/2, Page 2429-2431 in Rejoinder dated 27.09.2025 to Reply of Respondent No. 5.

23. That the contents of Paragraph 15 are denied as incorrect. It is clarified that the Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No. 57901/2024 in W.P. (C) No. 4677/1985 was filed by one Ms. Bhavreen Kandhari and not the Appellant.
24. That the contents of Paragraph 16 do not merit any comment.
25. That with respect to the contents of Paragraphs 17 and 18, it is denied that the answering Respondent No. 6 has no role or locus in granting permissions relating to the project. It is submitted that the Standard Operating Procedure for Tree Felling/ Transplantation dated 24.04.2025, GNCTD, is empowered under Section 33 of the Act to give directions to the Tree Officer, Tree Authority and subordinate officers for carrying out the purposes of the Act. However, Respondent No. 6 has acted in breach of its statutory obligations by turning a blind eye to the manner in which trees have been illegally felled by Respondent No. 5 and to how certain officers have misreported the numbers, even before the Constitutional Court. More importantly, Respondent No. 6 is the initiating authority for granting Stage I and Stage II Forest Clearance and also the Final Section 2 Order under the Van (Sanrakshan Evam Samvardhan) Adhiniyam, 1980, for the use of forest-like areas,

such as the Morphological Ridge. As stated earlier, without Stage I forest clearance, no EC can be granted in view of the OM dated 11.04.2022, annexed as Annexure A/18 of IA No. 451/2025 dated 01.07.2025 filed by Appellant. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also held in several Orders that utilisation of any land from the ridge area, including morphological ridge, would require clearance under the Van (Sanrakshan Evam Samvardhan) Adhiniyam, 1980, as morphological ridge has to be accorded the same level of protection as a notified ridge [Order dated 08.02.2023 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in T.N. Godavarman case at Page 1962 of the IA No. 451 of 2025; Judgment dated 29.11.2021 in T.N. Godavarman vs Union of India (2022) 4 SCC 289]. Subsequently, the developments in the Oversight Committee meetings are being considered by this Hon'ble Tribunal in the case of Sonya Ghosh v. GNCTD & Ors [O.A. No. 58 of 2013] wherein it has also been recommended that any area forming part of the morphological ridge would require clearance under the Van (Sanrakshan Evam Samvardhan) Adhiniyam, 1980 [Refer Annex A17, Pg 2049 and 2051 of IA No. 451 of 2025].

Date: 27.10.2025

Place: New Delhi

DRAWN & FILED BY:

Mbachani

Mansi Bachani, Gitanjali Sanyal & Surya Gupta

Advocates for the Appellant

29, LGF, Presidential Estate

Nizamuddin East, New Delhi 110013

Email: eldflegal@gmail.com +91- 8851323704

SETTLED BY:

Mr. Sanjay Upadhyay

[Senior Advocate]

IN THE HON'BLE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI
APPEAL No. 15 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

Vasant Kunj Residents Welfare Association
Sector-B, Pocket-1 ...Appellant

-Versus-

Ministry of Environment, Forest
and Climate Change & Ors. ...Respondent

AFFIDAVIT

I, Aby Johnson S/o J.P. Abraham, aged about 40, am the Authorised Signatory for the Vasant Kunj Residents Welfare Association, Sector-B, Pocket-1, South West Delhi, Delhi -110070, do hereby solemnly affirms and declares as under:

1. That I am fully conversant of the facts and circumstances of the matter and am competent to swear this Affidavit.
2. The contents of the accompanying Rejoinder are true and current to the best of my knowledge and have been drafted by the counsel on my instructions and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.
3. That the Annexures in the accompanying Rejoinder are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Neelam Sharma
27/09/2025
I identified the deponent who has signed in my presence

A Johnson
DEPONENT

VERIFICATION:

27 SEP 2025

Verified at New Delhi on this day of....., 2025 that the contents of the above affidavit are true and correct to my knowledge and belief and nothing material has been concealed therefrom.



ATTESTED
Neelam Sharma
NOTARY (Govt. of India)
Neelam Sharma, Advocate
Enrol. No.-D1281/2001
Ch. No. 165A, Gate No. 11
Patiala House Courts,
New Delhi-110001
(M): 9899408301

A Johnson
DEPONENT

27 SEP 2025

24

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
OFFICE OF THE DY. CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (SOUTH)
NEAR DR. KARNI SINGH SHOOTING RANGE
TUGHLAKABAD NEW DELHI -110044

F- 305/TO(S)/TOC/2024-25/ 11

Date-13/05/24

To,

The Station House Officer,
Police Station, Vasant Kunj,
New Delhi

Sub:- Lodging of FIR/Complaint under Section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in respect of offence punishable u/s 8/24 of the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994.

Sir,

It is inform you that a complaint received in telephone dated 10.09.2024 against illegal cutting of trees at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-I, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi.

Upon receiving of the abovementioned complaint, and inspection has been carried out by the officials of South Forest Division on 10.09.2024 & 13.09.2024 regarding tree offence at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-I, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi where tree offence was committed by The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh. Rohit Sejwal (Builder). Upon inspection, it was found that illegal cutting/rood damage/dry of tree without obtaining permission of the Competent Authority.

Thus, the case is hereby referred to The Section House Officer, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi for filing of FIR/Complaint under Section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in respect of offence punishable u/s 8/24 of the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994.

Encl.:-

1. Inspection report & Photographs.
2. Court Copy.



Ramesh
13/05/24
Range Officer
South Forest Division
Tughalkabad, New Delhi-44

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
OFFICE OF THE DY. CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (SOUTH)
NEAR DR. KARNI SINGH SHOOTING RANGE
TUGHLAKABAD NEW DELHI – 110044

F- 305/TO(S)/TOC/2024-25/11

Date: 13/09/24

To,

The Station House Office,
Police Station, Vasant Kunj,
New Delhi

Sub: - Lodging of FIR/Complaint under Section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in respect of offence punishable u/s 8/24 of the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994.

Sir,

It is inform you that a complaint received in telephone dated 10.09.2024 against illegal cutting of trees at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket -1, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi.

Upon receiving of the abovementioned complaint, inspection has been carried out by the officials of South Forest Division on 10.09.2024 & 13.09.2024 regarding tree offence at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector – B, Pocket-1, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi where tree offence was committed by The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh.Rohit Sejwal (Builder). Upon inspection, it was found that illegal cutting/rood damage/dry of tree without obtaining permission of the Competent Authority

Thus, the case is hereby referred to The Section House Officer, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi for filing of FIR/Complaint under Section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in respect of offence punishable u/s 8/24 of the Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994.

Encl.: -

1. Inspection report & Photographs,
2. Court Copy.

-/SD/-

Range Officer
South Forest Division
Tughalkabad, New Delhi-44



GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
OFFICE OF THE DY. CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (SOUTH)
NEAR DR. KARNI SINGH SHOOTING RANGE
TUGHLAKABAD NEW DELHI -110044
Email Id- dcfsouth.delhi@gov.in

F. No.- 303/TO(S)/TOC/2024-25/ 49/2-13

Dated 17/9/24

RESTRAINTMENT ORDER

This office is in receipt of a complaint regarding violation of Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994 by illegal cutting of trees at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-I, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi.

In this regard, the site has been inspected by the officials of South Forest Division, Department of Forest & Wildlife and it has been reported that illegal damage of trees have been found due to any work by The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh. Rohit Sejwal (Builder), Farm Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-I, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi and *Prime facie*, this is violation of DPTA, 1994 because of the on-going construction work.

Accordingly, The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh. Rohit Sejwal (Builder), Farm Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-I, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi is ordered to stop work that may damage trees and environment, on the site located at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-I, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi in order to prevent any further harm to the trees.

Tree Officer & Dy. Conservator of Forests
(South Forest Division)

To,

The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh. Rohit Sejwal (Builder),
Farm Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-I,
Vasant Kunj, New Delhi

Copy to,

1. The SHO, Police Station, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi for information and necessary action.

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI
OFFICE OF THE DY. CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (SOUTH)
NEAR DR. KARNI SINGH SHOOTING RANGE
TUGHLAKABAD NEW DELHI – 110044
Email Id – dcfsouth.delhi@gov.in

F. No. 303/TO(S)/TOC/2024-25/4912-13

Dated 17/9/24

RESTRAINTMENT ORDER

This office is in receipt of a complaint regarding violation of Delhi Preservation of Trees Act, 1994 by illegal cutting of trees at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-1, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi

In this regard, the site has been inspected by the officials of South Forest Division, Department of Forest & Wildlife and it has been reported that illegal damage of trees have been found due to any work by The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh. Rohit Sejwal (Builder). Farm Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-1, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi and *Prime facie*, this is violation of DPTA, 1994 because of the on-going construction work.

Accordingly, The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh. Rohit Sejwal (Builder), Farm Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector B, Pocket-1, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi is ordered to stop work that may damage trees and environment, on the site located at Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector B, Pocket-1, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi in order to prevent any further harm to the trees.

-Sd-

**Tree Officer & Dy. Conservator of Forests
(South Forest Division)**

To,

The Owner/Sh. Rakesh Sharma & Sh. Rohit Sejwal (Builder),
Farm Khasra No. 1230/2, Sector-B, Pocket-1.
Vasant Kunj, New Delhi

Copy to,

1. The SHO, Police Station, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi for information and necessary action.



Service in Vasant Kunj RWA, Sector-B, Pocket-1 Vs. MOEF & CC & Ors. [Appeal No. 15 of 2025]

1 message

ELDF <eldflegal@gmail.com>

Mon, Oct 27, 2025 at 12:28 PM

To: rkhuranalegal@gmail.com, office@marklegal.co.in, jmalawoffices@gmail.com, Jyoti Mendiratta <jyoti.legal@gmail.com>
Cc: Mansi Bachani <mansi@eldfindia.com>, Gitanjali Sanyal <gitanjali@eldfindia.com>, Surya Gupta <surya@eldfindia.com>

Dear Sir/Ma'am

Please find the attached copy of the **Rejoinder Affidavit** on behalf of Vasant Kunj RWA, Sector-B, Pocket-1. to the Reply dated 26.06.2025 filed by Respondent No. 6, Department of Forest and Wildlife, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi in the above-mentioned case.

Thanks & Regards

--

Sameer Manher*Clerk**Enviro Legal Defence Firm**29, Presidential Estate LGF,**Nizamuddin East New Delhi – 110013**Ph. No. 011-40573181*

 **Rejoinder.pdf**
1180K