



\$~14, 17-20

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 74/2022
KISHAN LAL

.....Petitioner

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

versus

DHARMENDER AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, SC
with Mr. Akshat Kulshrestha,
Mr. D.S. Bhanu, Mr. Chinmay
Singh and Mr. Madan Mohan
Chaubey, Advs.

17

+ CONT.CAS(C) 75/2022, CM APPL. 12831/2022 & CM APPL.
34812/2023

MUSTAFA

.....Petitioner

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

versus

DHARMENDER AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, SC
with Mr. Akshat Kulshrestha,
Mr. D.S. Bhanu, Mr. Chinmay
Singh and Mr. Madan Mohan
Chaubey, Advs.

18

+ CONT.CAS(C) 76/2022
SUKHAN SAHANI

.....Petitioner

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

versus

DHARMENDER AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, SC
with Mr. Akshat Kulshrestha,
Mr. D.S. Bhanu, Mr. Chinmay
Singh and Mr. Madan Mohan
Chaubey, Advs.



19

+ CONT.CAS(C) 77/2022
DULARE LAL

.....Petitioner

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

versus

DHARMENDER AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, SC
with Mr. Akshat Kulshrestha,
Mr. D.S. Bhanu, Mr. Chinmay
Singh and Mr. Madan Mohan
Chaubey, Advs.

20

+ CONT.CAS(C) 78/2022
KRITI KUMAR

.....Petitioner

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

versus

DHARMENDER AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, SC
with Mr. Akshat Kulshrestha,
Mr. D.S. Bhanu, Mr. Chinmay
Singh and Mr. Madan Mohan
Chaubey, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

ORDER

12.03.2025

%

1. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent/NDMC has submitted that the directions of this Court insofar as allowing the present set of petitioners to continue to squat at the places located in Connaught Place, New Delhi have since been complied with.

2. Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, learned Standing Counsel for NDMC has placed on record an order passed by the Division Bench of this Court dated 10.09.2024 in W.P.(C) No. 12643/2021, whereby the following directions have been passed:



“10. In view of the above, we consider it apposite to dispose of these petitions by directing that the petitioners may continue to carry on their vending activities from the sites at Rajiv Chowk and Indira Chowk on temporary basis. We are conscious that no directions can be issued to permit street vendors from carrying on their vending activities contrary to law. However, since the NDMC has taken a decision favourable to the petitioners in W.P.(C) No.11493/2016 and is abiding by the same, we consider it apposite not to interfere with the said decision of the NDMC. We clarify that the present order is premised solely on the NDMC's decision to permit the petitioners on humanitarian grounds at the material time. In so far as the petitioners' contention that they be accorded preference in allocation of spaces on account of them being persons with disabilities is concerned; no such order is required to be passed at this stage. Section 38 of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014, provides that the appropriate government would frame a scheme specifying all matters as provided in the Second Schedule to the Act. The Second Schedule to the Act expressly provides that the Scheme will include provisions as to 'the other categories of persons for preference for issue of certificate of vending'. The Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi has framed 'The Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Street vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Scheme, 2019'. Paragraph 6.2 of the said scheme contains provisions for according preference to persons with disabilities. Needless to state that at the appropriate stage of issuance of certificate of vending, the concerned authority shall comply with the provisions of the aforesaid scheme.”

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that in view of the directions passed by the Division Bench of this Court, the grievance of present set of petitioners stands satisfied.

4. Accordingly, the present contempt petitions are dismissed as satisfied. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.

MARCH 12, 2025/gunn/ss