

\$~61 to 63, 66 & 67

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

+ W.P.(C) 7176/2018

MANORANJAN KUMAR Petitioner

Through: Mr.N.K. Sahoo and Mr.S.B. Sahoo, Advs.

versus

SDMC AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Sangeeta Chandra, Advocate for
R-1/SDMC.

+ W.P.(C) 7178/2018

MANOJ KUMAR Petitioner

Through: Mr.N.K. Sahoo and Mr.S.B. Sahoo, Advs.

versus

SDMC AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Sangeeta Chandra, Advocate for
R-1/SDMC.
Mr.Anand V. Khatri, Advocate for R-2.

+ W.P.(C) 7191/2018

ASHOK KUMAR MAHTO Petitioner

Through: Mr.N.K. Sahoo and Mr.S.B. Sahoo, Advs.

versus

SDMC AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Sangeeta Chandra, Advocate for
R-1/SDMC.
Mr.Abhinav Singh and Ms.Maan Singh,
Advocates for R-2.

+ W.P.(C) 7201/2018

RAKESH RANJAN KUMAR Petitioner

Through: Mr.N.K. Sahoo and Mr.S.B. Sahoo, Advs.

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Sangeeta Chandra, Advocate for
R-1/SDMC.
Ms.Anya Singh, Advocate for R-2.

+ W.P.(C) 7202/2018
AVINASH KUMAR Petitioner
Through: Mr.N.K. Sahoo and Mr.S.B. Sahoo, Advs.
versus
SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION AND ANR
..... Respondents
Through: Ms.Rukhmini Bobde and Mr.Nivesh Kumar,
Advocate for R-1/SDMC.
Mr.Abhinav Singh and Mr.Vinod Kr. Goyal,
Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL

ORDER
% **13.07.2018**

These petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India have been filed by the petitioners. The petitioners claim to be regular street vendors. They complain that when they approached the respondents to accept their verification forms, they were not allowed to do so. The petitioners seek a writ of mandamus/directions to the respondent No.1 to accept the application forms.

Ms. Sangita Chandra, counsel for respondent No.1 enters appearance on an advance copy and submits that the present writ petition is an abuse of the process of law. The petitioners claim that they approached the respondents on 24.05.2018 for submission of forms whereas a copy of the form filed along with writ petition, shows the date to be 29.05.2018. She further submits that the last date of submission of the forms was 30.05.2018 and the election procedure has already been set into motion. She further submits that the forms cannot be accepted at this stage as it would result in stalling the entire election process. Even otherwise, it is submitted that there is no reason as per the averments made in the writ petition as to why the form was not accepted. Ms. Sangita Chandra, counsel for respondent No.1 very fairly submits that merely because the petitioners did not submit the forms, no prejudice would be caused to the rights

of the petitioners as in case they are found eligible by the Town Vending Committee (hereinafter referred to as 'TVC'), they would be allotted vending sites.

We have heard the counsel for the parties.

We find no merit in this writ petition as there is no explanation for the delay in approaching this Court. In case, the forms were not accepted on 24.05.2018, the petitioners should have approached this Court immediately keeping in mind that the last date for accepting the form was 30.05.2018. Besides, there is nothing on record to show that the petitioners took any steps to either contact any senior officer or protested in writing. At this stage, the election process cannot be derailed. However, we make it clear that in case the petitioners approach the TVC with all supporting documents as and when it becomes functional, the TVC shall consider the case of the petitioners in accordance with law.

The writ petitions stand disposed of in above terms.

G. S. SISTANI, J

SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J

JULY 13, 2018

afa