

\$~16

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

+ W.P.(C) 789/2017

CHANDER MOHAN

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Anand Shailani, Advocate

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Sri Harsha Peechara, ASC with Ms. Vidhi Jain, Advocate for respondent no.1 along with Mr. Narayan Kumar, ALO, NDMC.

Mr. Devvrat, Advocate for respondent no.2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD GOEL**

**ORDER**

% **30.01.2017**

Petitioner claims to be squatting near Gate no.4, Palika Bazar, Connaught Place, New Delhi. In support of his claim, the petitioner has placed on record copies of challans.

Learned counsel for the respondent/NDMC submits that the area, in question, has been declared as a no-squatting zone and, thus, the petitioner cannot be allowed to vend at the site, in question.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would be satisfied in case a direction is issued to the Town Vending Committee to consider the case of the petitioner for allotment of an alternate site. Learned counsel for the respondent has no objection to the same.

Accordingly, present writ petition stands disposed of with the following agreed directions:

- (i) The petitioner would make a representation to the Town Vending Committee in the prescribed form with supporting documents;

- (ii) The Town Vending Committee will consider the case of the petitioner expeditiously after taking into consideration all the material placed on record;
- (iii) In case a survey is conducted and the petitioner is not found squatting that by itself would not be a ground to reject the case of the petitioner, if the petitioner is able to place relevant documents on record.

**CM.APPL 3664/2017**

Application stands disposed of in view of above.

**G.S.SISTANI, J**

**VINOD GOEL, J**

**JANUARY 30, 2017/pst /**