



\$~11

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

+ **W.P.(C) 7360/2025 and CM APPL.33061/2025**

RANJEET MISHRA

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohtagi, PC for GNCTD
alongwith Mrs. Chandrika Sachdev
and Mr. Dhruv Kumar, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

06.08.2025

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing an order dated 20.05.2025, whereby the petitioner's request for allotment of space for running a Tea vending shop was declined and a direction was issued to close the concerned shop from which the petitioner has been operating within the SDM Seelampur Court Complex, as well as to remove the unauthorised structure erected by the petitioner. The operative portion of the impugned order is reproduced hereunder:-

"Now, therefore in the light of the above factual situations and considering the replies filed. and hearing given to Shri Ranjeet Mishra, Tea Seller, running a Tea Vending Shop within the SDM (Seelampur) Office Complex, G.T. Road, Seelampur, Delhi-110053, he is hereby directed to close the Tea Vending Shop and completely remove the encroached structure, iron and steel rods, Overhead tin shed.

Shri Ranjeet Mishra is hereby granted 03 days time to do the same after the after the receipt of this order. In case of failure of Sh. Ranjeet Mishra to remove the encroached structure, iron and steel rods, overhead tin shed, the same will be removed after the lapse of three days time.

It is made clear that, in the event of failure to obey the above stated



directions appropriate legal actions shall be taken against Shri. Ranjeet Mishra, Tea Seller, including the recovery of damage charges for unauthorized occupation of Government land from 2011 till now.”

2. The aforesaid order has been passed in the backdrop of the order dated 24.01.2025 passed by this Court whereby it was, *inter alia*, directed as under:-

“9. It appears that thereafter, without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, the impugned letter dated 13.01.2025 was issued. The impugned order acknowledges that the petitioner was directed to "appear before the undersigned", however, during the course of hearing today it is not disputed that in actual fact, the order was passed without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. Clearly, the impugned order is in disregard of the principles of natural justice.

10. Consequently, the impugned order is unsustainable in law. The same is accordingly, set aside.

11. It is made clear that in case any fresh action is sought to be taken by the concerned SDM against the petitioner, a Show Cause Notice, followed by an opportunity of hearing shall be afforded to the petitioner. The concerned SDM shall also take into account the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case.”

3. It is emphasised that no valid allotment letter has been issued to the petitioner for conducting business activities from SDM Seelampur Court Complex and that a letter issued by the local bar association cannot be construed as conferring a right in favour of the petitioner herein.

4. The petition does not disclose any legal right in favour of the petitioner to continue to carry on its vending activities from within the official premises. Today, learned counsel for the respondent submits that he has received instructions from the concerned SDM Seelampur in the following effect:

“After careful consideration and review of the applicable rules, policies and precedents, it is regretted to inform you that there is no provision or



possibility of granting a license-based allotment to the petitioner under the existing legal and regulatory framework”

5. In the circumstances, the present petition is dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

SACHIN DATTA, J

AUGUST 6, 2025/at