



\$~8

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1902/2025 and CM APPLs.9001-02/2025**

GAYATRI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Bharat Aggarwal, Advocate.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr Mananjay Mishra, Advocate for
NDMC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **14.02.2025**

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

“a) Direct the Respondents to consider the petitioner on the place of her deceased husband for all purposes.

b) Direct the Respondents to decide the petitioner's representation dated 21/01/2025 in accordance with law.”

2. The petitioner claims that she and her husband were carrying on their vending activities since 2006. The petitioner's husband since deceased, had also applied for *Tehbazari* licence under the Urban Street Vendor Scheme, 2007. The petitioner also claims that the petitioner's husband had participated in the surveys that were conducted after the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 came



into force. However, her husband has expired on 06.09.2024. In the circumstances, the petitioner filed a representation before the respondents seeking substitution of her name in place of her husband. Given the aforesaid context, the petitioner prays that directions be issued to the respondents to consider the petitioner in place of her husband.

3. In ***Kishwari Begam v. New Delhi Municipal Council WP(C) 9622/2020*** this court had considered a similar issue. The relevant extracts of the said judgment are set out below:

“6. Admittedly, no tehbazari license had been issued to the petitioner's deceased husband and therefore, the petitioner's claim that she be substituted in place of her deceased husband as a licence holder in the records of NDMC cannot be acceded to. The list of 628 eligible street vendors, which was prepared in the year 2012 was based on the applications made by the street vendors who were found to be carrying on the vending activities at the material time. Several of such street vendors had approached the Court and on the said basis, NDMC had drawn up a list of eligible street vendors. Some of those street vendors who have been continuously carrying on the vending activities were granted protective orders on the principle that all the street vendors who were carrying on activities at the time when the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 (hereafter the Street Vendors Act) came into force, were entitled to such protection under Section 3(3) of the Street Vendors Act.

7. Except as noted above, the 628 eligible street vendors are not required to be provided any special status. Since the petitioner's deceased husband, whose name is mentioned in the list of 628 street vendors has expired, it cannot be assumed that the petitioner is required to be substituted in his place. It is also important to note that Connaught Place (Rajiv Chowk and Indira Chowk) has been declared as No-Vending Zone. Therefore, the petitioner has no right to carry on street vending activities in the said area only on the ground that she is the legal heir of a street vendor, who she claims was unauthorizedly vending in the said area.

8. Mr. Sahoo, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has



drawn the attention of this Court to Rule 13 of the Delhi Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Rules, 2017 (hereafter *the Vending Rules*) and has stated that all the street vendors whose name find mention in the list prepared by the Chopra Committee and Thareja Committee would be entitled to participate in the elections for the first Town Vending Committee (hereafter *TVC*).

9. He submits that by virtue of Rule 13 of the Vending Rules, the petitioner's deceased husband had a right to participate in the elections. He submits that the petitioner being a sole legal heir of her deceased husband ought to be entitled to exercise the said right. In addition, Mr. Sahoo also referred to Para 3.3 of the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Scheme, 2019 (hereafter *Scheme*) which sets out the criteria for issuing certificate of vending (COV) for street vendors. Para 3.3 of the said scheme is set out below:-

“3.3 The criteria for issuing certificate of vending to street vendors

(3.3.1) The certificate of vending shall be issued to a registered street vendor in compliance with Section 2.1.1.

(3.3.2) The allotment of vending space shall be subject to demarcation of vending zones pursuant to Section 8.5, available vacancies on time-sharing basis and holding capacity.

(3.3.3) In case the number of applicants exceeds the available number of vending spaces determined, or exceeds 2.5% of the total population, the allotment will be made by seniority, that is, based on descending order of duration of vending activities at the current site, subject to categorical reservations described in Section 6.2. For a single vending site, allotment amongst the registered street vendors shall be made by draw of lots in case of oversubscription.

(3.3.4) The preference shall be given to Persons with Disability and Women in accordance with Section 6.2.

(3.3.5) The vendors who could not be issued COY as per their first choice shall be accommodated, subject to availability,



from a list of locations ranked in order of vendor preference, to avoid non- issuance altogether.

(3.3.6) Not more than one member of a family (consisting of spouse and dependent children) be given a Certificate of vending.

(3.3.7) The area/street where temporary vending is to take place will be notified by the TYC as outlined in Chapter 8.

(3.3.8) Categorization, demarcation and holding capacity of vending zones shall be decided by the Local Body in consultation with the TVC as outlined in Chapter 8.

(3.3.9) A Certificate of Vending will be subject to limited renewal in accordance with Chapter 4.

(3.3.10) The Local Body shall maintain an updated waiting list for oversubscribed vending zones for consideration in case of future availability of holding capacity. Such a waiting list shall be made available to applicants online.”

10. It is submitted that the petitioner being the sole legal heir of her deceased husband is also entitled to be accorded some seniority for the purpose of allocation of vending spaces. He also relies on Section 5(2) of the Street Vendors Act which reads as under:-

“5. (2) Where a street vendor to whom a certificate of vending is issued dies or suffers from any permanent disability or is ill, one of his family member in following order of priority, may vend in his place, till the validity of the certificate of vending—

(a) spouse of the street vendor;

(b) dependent child of the street vendor:

Provided that where a dispute arises as to who is entitled to vend in the place of the vendor, the matter shall be decided by the committee under section 20.”

11. In the present case, the petitioner’s deceased husband had not been issued any COV under the Street Vendors Act. However, there is no dispute if such a certificate had been issued, the petitioner would be entitled to have her name included in the COV in place of her deceased husband, as his widow.

12. Although, the petitioner’s deceased husband had not been



issued any COV, we are of the view that the same benefit ought to be made available to the petitioner as well. The petitioner cannot be prejudiced by the delay in issuance of COV or implementation of the Street Vendors Act. Consequently, we find merit in Mr. Sahoo's contentions that the petitioner would have the right to participate in the elections of the TVC in place of her deceased husband as stipulated under Rules 13 of the Vending Rules.

13. There is also no cavil with Mr. Sahoo's contention that, once the petitioner's claim is verified, she would also be accorded the benefit of the criteria for allocation of *tehbazari* license as stipulated under paragraph 3.3 of the Scheme.

14. In view of the above, we consider it apposite to dispose of the present petition by directing that the petitioner would be entitled to exercise the same rights as her deceased husband was under Rule 13 of the Vending Rules and would be accorded the benefit of seniority as her deceased husband would have been entitled to in terms of paragraph 3.3 of the Scheme, if he was alive, at an appropriate stage.

15. The present petition is disposed of in the above terms."

4. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents fairly states that subject to the verification, the petitioner would also be accorded the benefit of the aforesaid decision. The respondents are bound by the said statement.

5. In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of. Pending applications shall also stand disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

TEJAS KARIA, J

FEBRUARY 14, 2025/tr

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)