



\$~55

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

CNR No. DLHC010402652026

+ **W.P.(C) 12481/2026**

VIKAS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Baniwal, Adv.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Harshit Chopra, Standing Counsel
MCD alongwith Mr Khushal Chand
Aggarwal and Ms. Nidhi Mutreja,
Advocates for MCD
Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, Standing
Counsel for NDMC with Mr Soumit
Ganguli, Ms Ravicha Sharma & Mr
Akash Sharma, Advocates for NDMC.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **25.08.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, seeking directions to the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (*hereinafter*, 'MCD') to conduct the survey of the Petitioner in compliance with Section 3(1) of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 (*hereinafter*, 'the Act').



3. At the outset, Id. Counsel for the MCD submits that the Durgabai Deshmukh Metro Station falls in the area under the New Delhi Municipal Council and not MCD.
4. The Petitioner in the present case claims to be a vendor at Ring Road, Near Gate No. 2, Durgabai Deshmukh Metro Station, New Delhi. According to him, he has been vending at the said place for many years.
5. The Petitioner has placed on record *two* challans, allegedly issued by the MCD, dating back to 2019 and 2020.
6. The MCD and the NDMC are stated to have completed their surveys in 2025, and the Petitioner did not participate in the said survey.
7. The prayer in this petition is that a survey be conducted to include him in the list of vendors.
8. The survey, having already been concluded, the same cannot be reopened at this stage for the Petitioner. It is for the Town Vending Committee-II, to take a decision as to when the next survey would be conducted in this area.
9. If there is any future survey which is conducted, the Petitioner is permitted to participate in the same, in terms of Section 4(2) of the Act.
10. Until then, if the Petitioner is an unauthorized vendor, the NDMC is at liberty to take action in accordance with law.
11. This Court has not examined the merits and the genuinity of the *challans*, which have been placed on record.



12. Petition is disposed of in these terms. All pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J.

AUGUST 25, 2026

Rahul/sm