
(2012) 01 DEL CK 0235

In the Delhi High Court

Case No : Writ Petition (C) No. 2306 of 2011

Ms. Narmada

APPELLANT

Vs

Union of India and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-01-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2012) 01 DEL CK 0235

Hon'ble Judges : Rajiv Sahai Endlaw, J;A.K. Sikri, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Abhijeet Chatterjee, for the Appellant; Sapna Chauhan, for R-1, Mr. Ramesh Kumar, for R-2 and Mr. Sumeet Pushkarna, for R-3, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Mr. A.K. Sikri, Acting Chief Justice

1. This petition by way of Public Interest Litigation has been filed seeking to restrain the respondent No.3 Delhi Jal Board (DJB) from making use of or installing the Ductile Iron (DI) Pipes, supplied to the respondent No.3 DJB by the respondent No.4 Tata Metaliks Kubota Pipes Ltd. and allegedly lying stockpiled in Burari area of Delhi, for supply of drinking water to the residents of Delhi. It is the case of the petitioner that use of the said pipes for supply of drinking water is likely to cause a serious health hazard to the population of Delhi.

2. The counsel for the respondent No.3 DJB appearing on advance notice was asked to file an affidavit disclosing its stand and it was directed that the issuance of notice to the other respondents shall be dependent on that.

3. The respondent No.3 DJB has filed an affidavit denying that any pipes made by the respondent No.4 Tata Metaliks Kubota Pipes Ltd. were used in execution of work of laying waterlines in Burari constituency and further denying that any consignment of DI Pipes had been supplied by the respondent No.4 Tata Metaliks Kubota Pipes Ltd. to the respondent No.3 DJB. It is further stated that the allegations in the writ petition are baseless, imaginary and without any ground /

substance. It is yet further disclosed that in execution of the work in Burari constituency, pipes of Jindal Saw Ltd. and Electrosteel Castings Ltd. only were used. The respondent No.3 DJB has annexed to its said affidavit photocopies of the bills of the said companies showing purchase of the pipes from them.

4. Though the petitioner has filed a rejoinder controverting the stand of the respondent No.3 DJB but we are of the opinion that in view of the unequivocal categorical stand of the respondent No.3 DJB, no case for entertaining this petition in public interest is made out. The petition is accordingly dismissed. We refrain ourselves from imposing any costs on the petitioner.