

\$~17

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 168/2016**
KUSUM

..... Petitioner
Through Mr.Satish Kumar Tripathi and Mr.
Amit Kumar Tripathi, Advocates.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

..... Respondent
Through Mr.Shri Harsha Peechara and Mr.
Mananjay Mishra, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER
% **21.07.2016**

Petitioner is the widow of Satish Kumar. Contention of the petitioner before this Court is that her husband Satish Kumar was a squatter at the Sarojini Nagar Market, New Delhi. Further submission is that during his lifetime he preferred a writ petition i.e. W.P.(C) No.4469/2011 in which interim directions has been given in his favour which stated that if the petition is found eligible for allotment of permanent site under the new scheme, the interim protection already granted in his favour will continue till the time said scheme of allotment is implemented by respondent no.1. His additional submission is that he is protected under the provisions of Section 3(3) of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014. Learned counsel for the petitioner has

relied upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.136/2016 titled as Bhola Ram Patel vs. New Delhi Municipal Council & Anr.

Learned counsel for respondent does not dispute that the TVC (Town Vending Committee) qua respondent no.1 has been constituted. His submission is that the rights of the petitioner will be determined by the TVC. Accordingly, the petitioner is granted liberty to approach the TVC and the TVC will decide the case of the petitioner in accordance with law.

No further orders are called for in this petition.

Petition disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JULY 21, 2016
ndn