

\$~9

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

+ W.P.(C) 1333/2018

BHARAT BHUSHAN Petitioner

Through: Ms Mrinalini Khatri, Adv

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr Ajjay Aroraa and Mr Kapil Dutta,
Adv for NDMC

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

ORDER

% **18.07.2018**

The petitioner claims to be a regular street vendor and stated to be vending near Bus Terminal, Sultanpuri, Rohini. Fearing dispossession at the hands of the respondents has led to the filing of the present writ petition.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that since the election of the first Town Vending Committee (TVC) has taken place, the petitioner would approach TVC with all supporting documents as and when it becomes functional and, if for any reason, the petitioner is not found squatting, that alone should not be a ground to reject his case. He prays that a direction be issued to TVC to consider his case in accordance with law.

Counsel for the respondents, without admitting any of the averments made in the writ petition, submits that should the petitioner make an application with all supporting documents before the TVC, the same would be considered in accordance with law and merely because the petitioner is not found squatting, that itself alone would not be a ground

to reject the case of the petitioner.

Resultantly, the writ petition is disposed of with the following agreed directions:

- (i) The petitioner will approach the TVC as and when it is functional with all supporting documents; and
- (ii) The TVC will consider the case of the petitioner in accordance with law and merely because the petitioner is not found vending at the site at the time of survey, that by itself would not be a ground alone to reject his case.

We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

G.S.SISTANI, J

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J

JULY 18, 2018
SU