

\$~3

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

+ W.P.(C) 10096/2017
JAWAHAR LAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Medhanshu Tripathi, Advocate

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr.Sri Harsha Peechara, Standing counsel
for NDMC with Ms.Vidhi Jain and
Mr.Mananjay Mishra, Advts.
Mr.Anuj Aggarwal, ASC, GNCTD with
Ms.Deboshree Mukherjee, Advt. for R-3.
SI Rajesh Kumar, PS Kotla Mubarakpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. CHAWLA

ORDER

% **08.12.2017**

C.M.44076/2017 (u/O 1 Rule 10 CPC)

This is an application filed by the applicant/petitioner seeking impleadment of the SHO, PS Kotla Mubarakpur, as a necessary party in the petition.

Notice. Counsels appearing for the respondents accept notice. There is no opposition to the prayer made in the application.

Accordingly, the application is allowed. The SHO, PS Kotla Mubarakpur is impleaded as a party in the petition.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 10096/2017 & C.M.41281/2017 (stay)

It is the case of the petitioner that the allotment was made in favour of his father in respect of tehbazari Squat No.M-502, near Subway, INA Market, New Delhi - 110023 in the year 1999. The complaint of the petitioner is that the

petitioner was removed in the year 2009 on account of VIP movement. Further, he has been squatting at the said site till he was removed again on account of widening of the road.

Counsel for respondent no.1 had entered appearance on an advance copy and had sought time to seek instructions in the matter.

Today, counsels for the respondents submit that the petitioner has been accommodated at the site in INA Market as per the photographs duly signed by the counsels for all the parties, which shall form part of the record.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not being allowed to vend peacefully by the local shopkeepers. Local police shall ensure that no obstruction is caused to the petitioner as the petitioner apprehends harassment by co-shopkeepers, who have been threatening him. In case, an application for substitution is filed, the same shall be considered by the Town Vending Committee in accordance with law. It is made clear that the benefit will be granted only to one person in the family, as agreed.

In view of the fact that the petitioner has been accommodated, no further order is required to be passed in the present writ petition.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

C.M.41281/2017 also stands disposed of.

G.S.SISTANI, J

A.K. CHAWLA, J

DECEMBER 08, 2017

rb /

W.P.(C) 10096/2017

2/2