



Cont.P.No.2585 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.01.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **C.SARAVANAN**

Cont.P.No.2585 of 2022

Allikulam Vaniga Valaga Vyabarigal  
Nala Sangam

... Petitioner

vs

Mr.Gagandeep Singh Bedi, I.A.S.,  
Commissioner, Greater Chennai Corporation,  
Chennai – 600 003.

... Respondent

Prayer: Petition filed under Section 11 of Contempt of Court Act, to punish the Respondent herein for will wilful disobedience of the order passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.No.20839 of 2021 dated 12.08.2022.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Jaishankar

For Respondent : Mr.Rahul Aditya  
for Mrs.P.T.Ramadevi  
Standing Counsel



Cont.P.No.2585 of 2022

WEB COPY

### **ORDER**

The petitioner has filed W.P.No.20839 of 2022, for the following relief:

*“This Writ Petition has been filed for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to take immediate action based on the representation given by the petitioner dated 08.07.2022 and 14.07.2022.”*

2. By an order dated 12.08.2022 in W.P.No.20839 of 2022, the following order was passed:-

*“4. It is submitted that there is rampant encroachment by the hawkers. The footfalls of the customers in the Allikulam Commercial Complex has thus come down drastically. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been sending several representations, however, the representations have neither evoked any response nor any action from the first and second respondents.*

*5. The learned counsel for the second respondent submits that representations of the petitioner will be considered and disposed by the second respondent on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”*



Cont.P.No.2585 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, notice have been issued to the street vendors on 25.11.2022.

4. Mr.N.G.R.Prasad, learned counsel for the intervenor submits that the notice issued on 25.11.2022 to the street vendors is contrary to the Provisions of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014, and that the earlier Committee constituted by the Government has been held to be ultravires the provisions of the Act and a fresh Town Vending Committee has been directed to be constituted.

5. It is submitted that the street vendors are likely to be evicted by the by the respondent and therefore they will be filing separate writ petition.

6. Considering the fact that the respondent has indeed issued a notice, pursuant to directions of this Court in the exercise of power conferred under the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and



WEB COPY



*Cont.P.No.2585 of 2022*

**C.SARAVANAN, J.**  
rgm

Regulation of Street Vendors) Act, 2014, I am of the view that there is no case made out for contempt. Accordingly, this contempt petition is closed. However, liberty is given to the parties to workout their remedy before the Appropriate Authority in accordance with law.

**03.01.2023**

Index : Yes/ No

Internet : Yes/No

rgm

Cont.P.No.2585 of 2022