

\$~19, 22 and 23.

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

+ W.P.(C) 1764/2020 and CM APPL. 6147/2020

+ W.P.(C) 1781/2020 and CM APPL. 6188/2020

+ W.P.(C) 1784/2020 and CM APPL. 6209/2020

SANJEEV KUMAR

..... Petitioner

BHIKKI RAM

..... Petitioner

BALAK RAM

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. N.K. Sahoo and Ms. S.B. Sahoo,
Advocates

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL THROUGH ITS
CHAIRMAN & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Yoginder Handoo, ASC with
Mr. Rheer Verma and Mr. Ashish Tiwari,
Advocates for NDMC in W.P.(C) 1764/2020.

Mr. Abhinav Sharma, Advocate for R-2 in
W.P.(C) 1764/2020.

Mr. Sri Harsha Peechara, ASC with Mr. Aditya
Vikram Singh, Advocate for NDMC in W.P.(C)
1781/2020 and 1784/2020.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ASHA MENON

ORDER

%

17.02.2020

1. This is the third round of litigation initiated by the petitioners. Previously, in the year 2017, the petitioners and some others had approached the High Court by filing writ petitions claiming *inter alia* that they were vending at Janpath Lane, on the side of Bank of Baroda building or opposite/adjacent to LIC building, Connaught Place, New Delhi and they had sought directions to the respondent/NDMC to restore their vending sites.

All the said petitions were disposed of by a Co-ordinate Bench vide a common order dated 12.09.2017, wherein it was held that the petitioners were all hawkers and that being the position, they could not seek any permission to hawk at a fixed place and that they were not vendors and their names did not find mention in the list of 628 street vendors. In fact, they were found to be blocking free movement of pedestrians. As a result, relief was declined to all the petitioners. However, liberty was granted to them that as and when the Town Vending Committee (TVC) is made functional, they may approach the TVC with the supporting documents for their case to be considered and decided in accordance with law.

2. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order, the petitioners herein approached the Supreme Court by filing SLPs, which were dismissed vide order dated 16.02.2018. Now, the petitioners have approached this Court stating *inter alia* that some facts were not brought to the notice of the Supreme Court, which they seek to bring out now.

3. We decline to entertain the present petitions on the ground stated above. If it is the stand of the petitioners that they have omitted to bring certain relevant facts to the notice of the Supreme Court, it is for them to seek appropriate legal recourse.

4. The present petitions are dismissed alongwith the pending applications.

HIMA KOHLI, J

ASHA MENON, J