



\$~22

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 711/2022**
SHIV PUJANPetitioner

Through: Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Mr. Aditya
Verma and Mr. Birinder Singh,
Advocates

versus

NARESH KUMARRespondent

Through: Mr. Sriharsha Peechara, Standing
Counsel, NDMC with Mr. Akshat
Kulshreshtha and Mr. Akhilesh Loya,
Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER
22.07.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed alleging the willful disobedience of the order passed by this Court on 21st December, 2012, in W.P.(C) 5193/2012.
2. The operative part of the said order is reproduced below:-

“6. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that in case the petitioner fulfills the criteria laid down by the Supreme Court in the order dated 12.10.2012, his possession will not be disturbed, in case he is squatting at the site.”

3. Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that there have been subsequent developments since the aforesaid order was passed.
4. In the year 2014, the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014, was enacted. Further, there have been subsequent judgments of the Supreme Court on the issue. He further



submits that the name of the petitioner is not mentioned in the list of 628 eligible vendors identified by the Supreme Court.

5. Attention of the Court has been drawn to the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court on 11th October, 2021, in W.P.(C) 11669/2021, wherein, it has been noted that Rajeev Chowk and Indira Chowk have been declared as no-hawking and no-vending zones.

6. In view of the aforesaid, no case for initiating contempt proceedings is made out.

7. Accordingly, the contempt petition is closed while giving liberty to the petitioner to invoke remedies that may be available to him in law.

AMIT BANSAL, J

JULY 22, 2025
ds