

\$~2

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

+ W.P.(C) 3304/2014 & CM No. 6821/2014

B.K. JINDAL & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms Shirali Singh, Advocate.

versus

THE SECRETARY & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Mansi Gupta, Advocate for  
MCD/R-4.

Ms Anya Singh, Advocate for R-1, R-  
2, R-3, R-5 and R-6.

Mr Sunil Dalal, Advocate for R-7 to  
R-16.

SI Sudhir, PS Keshav Puram.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**

%

**28.08.2018**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

- “a) to issue directions to the respondent No.1, 3, 4, 5, & 6 to remove the encroachers from the streets and thereby make sure that the encroachers will not encroach in future the street;
- b) to direct the respondent no.2 to maintain cleanliness on the streets after removing all the hazardous garbage/other things from the road;
- c) to direct the respondent no.5 & 6 police to take

appropriate legal action against the encroachers, if any, to encroach the road in future in the interest of justice.”

2. The petitioners were essentially aggrieved by the encroachment on Talab Road, Onkar Nagar-A, Tri Nagar, Delhi. It is the petitioner’s case that the said road has been encroached upon by vegetable vendors, which has made it extremely difficult for the persons residing at the said road to access their respective residences. It is also stated that the vegetable vendors in question throw waste and litter the street leaving the same in a very unhygienic condition.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent states that North Delhi Municipal Corporation (respondent no.4) has been taking the action against the street vendors in question. It is also affirmed that North DMC had also imposed penalties and also confiscated some of their articles. The learned counsel for North DMC further states that adequate measures are being taken to ensure that the street in question remains in a hygienic condition.

4. This Court in its order dated 20.02.2018 recorded the statement of the learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioner no.1 is satisfied in the manner in which other private respondents (respondent no.7 to respondent no.16) have conducted themselves since institution of the writ petition.

5. In view of the above, it does not appear that petitioner no.1 has any further grievance in the matter. It is further pointed out that petitioner no.2 does not reside at the area in question and, therefore, there is no occasion to use the road in question.

6. In view of the affidavit filed on behalf of North DMC (respondent no.4) and the statement made on behalf of petitioner no.1, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of. The pending application is also disposed of.

**VIBHU BAKHRU, J**

**AUGUST 28, 2018**  
**MK**