

\$~26 to 37

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

26+ W.P.(C) 233/2016

LAXMI DEVI @ LAXMA

..... Petitioner

Versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR

..... Respondents

27+ W.P.(C) 234/2016

RAJU @ DAULAT RAM

..... Petitioner

Versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR

..... Respondents

28+ W.P.(C) 235/2016

RAJU

..... Petitioner

Versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR

..... Respondents

29+ W.P.(C) 236/2016

JOGINDER KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR

..... Respondents

30+ W.P.(C) 237/2016

NARESH SAH

..... Petitioner

Versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR

..... Respondents

31+ W.P.(C) 238/2016

SUKHPAL

..... Petitioner

Versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR

..... Respondents

32+ W.P.(C) 242/2016

RAJBIR

..... Petitioner

Versus

Page 1 of 4

- NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR Respondents
- 33+ W.P.(C) 245/2016
BRAHMA PRAKASH Petitioner
Versus
NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR Respondents
- 34+ W.P.(C) 246/2016
SURENDER SINGH AHUJA Petitioner
Versus
NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR Respondents
- 35+ W.P.(C) 249/2016
NARESH CHAND Petitioner
Versus
NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR Respondents
- 36+ W.P.(C) 250/2016
KAMALA DEVI Petitioner
Versus
NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR Respondents
- 37+ W.P.(C) 252/2016
ROSHAN LAL Petitioner
Versus
NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR Respondents
- Counsel for petitioner: Mr. Satish Kumar Tripathi, Adv.
Counsel for respondent: Mr. Mananjay Kumar Mishra, Adv. for
NDMC.
Mr. Ronvijay Gohain, Officer of R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

12.01.2016

%

1. The petitioner in each of these petitions claim to be vending from

different places on the footpath in front of Block-C, Central Market East Kidwai Nagar, New Delhi and have filed these petitions to restrain the respondents New Delhi Municipal Council (NDMC) and National Building Construction Company (NBCC) from dispossessing the petitioners from different places from where they claim to be vending.

2. I had in earlier stint on this Roster passed detailed orders in similar petitions i.e. order dated 30th June, 2015 in W.P.(C) No.6115/2015 titled ***Brahm Pal Vs. New Delhi Municipal Council*** and other connected petitions and order dated 11th August, 2015 in W.P.(C) No.6694/2015 titled ***Rajnesh Vs. South Delhi Municipal Corporation*** and other connected petitions and had *inter alia* observed that even though the Town Vending Committee within the meaning of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 has not been constituted as yet but protection as is sought in these petitions cannot be granted *inter alia* for the reasons that the provision in that regard already exist in the Act and for the reason that for this Court to return any finding, factual enquiry will have to be conducted, whether each of the petitioner is street vending from the location claimed or not and which inquiry is not in the domain of this Court but is to be conducted by the Town Vending Committee to be constituted.


3. Moreover, the counsel for the respondent NDMC appearing on advance notice states that the Town Vending Committee has been constituted, as informed before the Contempt Court.

4. The counsel for the petitioners has not been able to make out any case why a view different from what was taken in ***Brahm Pal*** and ***Rajnesh*** supra should be taken.

5. These petitions are accordingly dismissed.
6. I am refraining from imposing any costs as were imposed in W.P.(C) No.6694/2015, taking a lenient view and in the hope that no further petitions will be preferred.
6. The counsel for the petitioners seeks liberty to approach the Town Vending Committee.
7. Liberty is given in accordance with law.

JANUARY 12, 2016

bs



RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.