



\$~82

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 13235/2025, CM APPL. 54255/2025, CM APPL.
56329/2025 & CM APPL. 57870/2025
YAMUNA KAMAL CLUBPetitioner

Through: Mr. Krishan Kumar and Mr. Vinay
Chadda, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manika Tripathy, Standing
Counsel for DDA with Mr. Gautam
Yadav and Mr. Akash Mahor,
Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Sunil Satyarthi, Mr. Archisha
Satyarthi and Mr. Aditya Raj,
Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

18.09.2025

1. The present petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

“a. *summon the record of the entire Online Booking Process and Online Booking System of the Respondent No. 1 to ascertain the factual reality of its malfunctioning and faulty record, not showing the correct position about the Petitioner holding Ramleela functions/celebrations on the site/Plot No. EZ-68B & EZ-68C, total area measuring 6585 sq. mtrs., both part of GTB Grounds, Opposite GTB Hospital, Delhi- 110093, in the last two years, i.e. 2023 and 2024, as is evident from the orders of this Hon'ble Court, i.e. order dated 20.05.2024 in W.P. (C) No. 12337/2023 and order dated 23.09.2024 in W.P. (C) No. 11669/2024;*



- b. *issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate order or direction in the nature thereof, directing the Respondent No.1 to accept the Booking Application of the Petitioner sent by post (Annexure- 'P12') to the officials of the Respondent No. 1, as the Online Booking System of the Respondent No. 1 was not accepting the Booking Application of the Petitioner for holding Ramleela celebrations at the site/Plot No. EZ-68B & EZ-68C, total area measuring 6585 sq. mtrs., both part of GTB Grounds, Opposite GTB Hospital, Delhi-110093, in the year 2025, due to manipulations done by the officials of the Respondent No. 1 to favour the Respondent No. 2, with ulterior considerations. The Booking Application of the Petitioner given offline be treated at par with the Online, in the facts and circumstances of the case;*
- c. *issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate order or direction in the nature thereof, directing the Respondent No. 1 to allot the site/Plot No. EZ-68B & EZ-68C, total area measuring 6585 sq. mtrs., both part of GTB Grounds, Opposite GTB Hospital, Delhi-110093, for holding Ramleela functions/celebrations in the year 2025, in accordance with the SOP for the year 2025 (Annexure- 'P7'), acknowledging the undeniable eligibility and entitlement of the Petitioner in terms of Clause 2 of the SOP;*
- d. *issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate order or direction in the nature thereof, directing the Respondent No. 1 not to entertain the Online Booking Application made by the Respondent No. 2 with respect to the site/Plot No. EZ- 68B & EZ-68C, total area measuring 6585 sq. mtrs., both part of GTB Grounds, Opposite GTB Hospital, Delhi- 110093, since the Respondent No. 2 is not eligible and entitled under the SOP for the year 2025 (Annexure-'P7') and was also denied permission to hold Ramleela functions at the said site/plot in the year 2023 and 2024 as per the SOP for the*



said years, as is evident from the orders of this Hon'ble Court, i.e. order dated 20.05.2024 in W.P. (C) No. 12337/2023 and order dated 23.09.2024 in W.P. (C) No. 11669/2024."

2. Essentially, the grievance of the petitioner is with regard to blocking of open space comprised in Plot Nos. EZ-68B and EZ-68C opposite GTB Hospital (hereinafter 'open space') in favour of respondent no.2 i.e. Adarsh Ramlila Committee through Shri Ram Kumar Rana, for the purpose of Ramleela.

3. Mr. Krishan Kumar, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the open space for Ramleela has been blocked on 14.08.2025 by the DDA in favour of respondent no.2 contrary to its own SOP. Elaborating on his submission, he submits that the SOP dated 14.08.2025 of DDA provides that a society/trust which has continuously booked the Ramleela site in the preceding year will be given preference for booking the same site for the year 2025 on production of proof of booking for 2 years out of the last 3 years. The relevant extract from the SOP is as under:

"2. Societies/Trusts which were continuously booking the representative Ramleela Sites in the preceding year will be given preference for booking the same site for 2025 on production of proof of booking for 2 years out of the last three years."

4. He submits that respondent/DDA has blocked the open space in favour of the respondent no.2/Committee despite the fact that the said Committee had not organized Ramleela for the years 2023, as well as, 2024. He submits that it is only in the year 2022, that Ramleela was performed by respondent no.2 at the given open space. He submits that Ramleela was



organized at the given open space opposite GTB Hospital by the petitioner in the years 2023 and 2024.

5. To buttress his contention, Mr. Krishan Kumar has placed reliance on the judgment dated 18.10.2023 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) 12316/2023 to contend that the petitioner was allotted the site for performing Ramleela by the direction of this Court. Likewise, for the year 2024 the petitioner was again allotted the site by this Court *vide* order dated 23.09.2024 in W.P.(C) 11669/2024.

6. Further, inviting attention of the Court to the order dated 23.09.2024 passed in W.P.(C) 11669/2024, Mr. Kumar submits that the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent/DDA had stated on record that the respondent no.2 herein was not eligible for allotment of the open space, as it had not organized Ramleela on the said space even the previous year, i.e. 2023 and accordingly, it was stated that petitioner herein is eligible and had rightly been allotted the site by virtue of Clause (2) of SOP for the year 2024.

7. He further clarifies that in the year 2023, the petitioner could organize Ramleela only partially, as the Dussehra festival was scheduled on 24.10.2023, whereas this Court had passed judgment in favour of the petitioner only on 18.10.2023 in W.P.(C) 12316/2023 leaving few days for staging Ramleela. He contends that it is not in dispute that Dussehra festival was organized by the petitioner at the given open space in the year 2023. To support his contention, he has handed over across the Bar, a letter dated 04.09.2025 issued by the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Shahdara, Delhi addressed to the Deputy Director (IL), DDA wherein it has been stated that after the judgment was passed by this Court on 18.10.2023, Ramleela was



organized by Sh.Tej Prakash (President, Yamuna Kamal Club) only at the end of Dussehra festival i.e. on 24.10.2023.

8. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.2 has invited attention of the Court to the order of the DCP dated 01.09.2025 wherein it has been mentioned that no Ramleela was conducted during the year 2023 at the given site. He further submits that in the year 2024, the site was not vacated by the petitioner within the given time, therefore, petitioner ought to have been black listed and its security deposit should have been forfeited. It is further submitted that he has instructions to state that security deposit has not been refunded to the petitioner.

9. On a specific query posed by this Court as to whether the petitioner has been black-listed in terms of the SOP, Ms. Manika Tripathi learned Standing Counsel for the DDA responds in the negative.

10. Insofar as the security deposit is concerned, she submits that the amount has not been refunded. However, on further being queried, she submits that she has no instructions as to whether there is any order of forfeiture.

11. She further submits that counter-affidavit could not be filed in the present petition as decision of allotment of open space in favour of respondent no.2 had to be revisited in view DCP's subsequent letter dated 04.09.2025.

12. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant records.

13. At the outset, this Court observes that the mandate of the SOP dated 14.08.2025, as applicable to the present case, in no uncertain term provides that preference for booking open spaces for the purpose of Ramleela will be



given to those societies/trusts who are able to substantiate their claims of having organized Ramleela in the preceding years. For the said purpose, the open spaces were to be blocked from 01.08.2025 to 10.09.2025 for booking. Societies/trusts having booked and organised Ramleela at the respective sites for two out of the last three years, were required to book the said spaces by 10.09.2025 along with successful payment status. The relevant portion of the SOP is reproduced hereunder:

- “1. The open spaces that were booked in the preceding years for the purpose of Ramleela, will be blocked from 1st August to 10th September, 2025 for booking, to afford preference to those Societies/Trusts who are able to substantiate their claims of having organized Ramleela in the previous years at any particular site. Booking shall start on the website w.e.f. 01.08.25. The Societies/Trusts will have to get the respective sites booked by 10th September, 2025 along with successful payment status.*
- 2. Societies/Trusts which were continuously booking the represective Ramleela Sites in the preceding year will be given preference for booking the same site for 2025 on production of proof of booking for 2 years out of the last three years.”*

14. It is the case of the petitioner that for the past two consecutive years, petitioner has successfully been allotted the open space bearing Plot Nos. EZ-68B & EZ-68C with a total area measuring 6585 sq. mtrs., both part of GTB Ground, Opposite GTB Hospital, Delhi-110093 for holding Ramleela Celebrations for years 2023 and 2024. The said fact with regard to the year 2023 is evident from the judgment dated 18.10.2023 of this Court passed in W.P.(C) No.12316/2023 titled ‘Yamuna Kamal Club v. Delhi Development Authority’. The petitioner, in the said case, had challenged the cancellation of its booking of the same space for Ramleela, by the DDA. Allowing the



challenge laid by the petitioner, this Court permitted Yamuna Kamal Club to go ahead with its booking for Ramleela function at the said plot. The relevant part of the judgment reads as under:

“21. In the foregoing circumstances, the Impugned Communication cancelling the booking of the Petitioner is set aside. The Petitioner is permitted to go ahead with its booking for Ramleela function at plot no. EZ-68C and EZ-68B of total 6585 sq. mtrs., both part of G.T.B. Ground, Opp. G.T.B. Hospital, Delhi for the period from 02.10.2023 to 31.10.2023.”

15. As regard the year 2024, reliance has been placed by the petitioner on order dated 23.09.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No.11669/2024 titled ‘*Adarsh Ramlila Committee thro Ram Kumar Rana v. DDA & Anr.*’. The said petition was preferred by the respondent no.2 herein challenging the cancellation of the booking made by it with regard to the open space opposite GTB Hospital. Dismissing the said petition in favour of the petitioner herein [respondent no.2 in W.P.(C) 11669/2024], this Court held that the petitioner had applied online for the year 2024 on 06.08.2024, which was even confirmed. The relevant paras of the said order read thus:

“6. At the outset, the plea raised by learned senior counsel for the petitioner that a mere payment of the booking amount on 01.08.2024, as evidenced by the Challan forming part of Annexure P-1, would amount to confirmation of the booking, is not sustainable in law. The booking receipt itself indicates that “Required space has been blocked subject to verification of documents and receipt of required payment”. As was rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for respondent no.1/DDA, the respondent no.2 had applied for booking of the space on 06.08.2024, which was even ‘confirmed’, the screenshot of which confirmation has been placed on record as Annexure-R-2/A.

7. Thus, it is borne out that the respondent no.2 had applied online and for the fact that even last year, the same society/trust



had organized Ramleela at the site, it was otherwise eligible vide Clause (2) of the SOP. The said aspect is brought out in the judgment dated 18.10.2023 delivered by this Court in W.P. (C) 12316/2023 titled Yamuna Kamal Club v DDA.

8. *Therefore, the position that emerges is that although no reasons were assigned in the impugned cancellation letter dated 05.08.2024, the reasons for cancellation have been well explained during the course of arguments. To recapitulate, the petitioner was never confirmed the booking of the site and the respondent no.2 applied within time, therefore, the booking was confirmed in favour of the respondent no.2, who was eligible by virtue of Clause (2) of the SOP.*

9. *It would not be out of place to indicate that the constitutional validity of the SOP has not been assailed in the present writ petition. Therefore, there is nothing to suggest that the allotment of the site in question to respondent no.2 by the respondent, DDA is arbitrary, or a wrongful exercise of its powers, or illegal in any manner.*

10. *Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed. The pending application also stands dismissed.”*

16. From the above, it is abundantly clear that the petitioner herein was allotted the subject open space for conducting Ramleela function for the past two consecutive years, i.e., 2023 and 2024. The said fact makes the petitioner duly eligible to retain the same as the preferred allottee for the present year as well, in accordance with the SOP dated 14.08.2025, as against the claim of respondent no.2, which had booked the open space only in the year 2022.

17. In furtherance of the above, petitioner was required to make the booking before 10.09.2025, which the petitioner attempted to do on 14.08.2025. Regardless, having found the said space to be blocked on the website of DDA, petitioner approached this Court well in time, on 28.08.2025.



18. At the time of online booking, petitioner was denied its bid on the ground that it had not made two bookings earlier. Rather, the said space was allotted in favour of respondent no.2, in contravention of the SOP of DDA itself, and contrary to the fact of petitioner's past two bookings, as noted above.

19. The respondent no.2 has opposed the plea of petitioner on the ground that in the year 2023, petitioner had not conducted Ramleela at the subject open space. In support of said contention, reliance has been placed on the order dated 01.09.2025 of DCP, Shahdara District, Delhi. It is true that the said order states that in the year 2022, Ramleela was conducted by respondent no.2, while in 2024, it was conducted by petitioner. Further, for the year 2023, it is noted *"No stage Ramleela was conducted during the year 2023 at the said ground"*.

20. Reliance on the said order is, however, misplaced since a subsequent letter/order of the DCP is placed on record by the petitioner. The said order dated 04.09.2025 clearly states that Ramleela was organised by petitioner at the end of Dussehra Festival on 24.10.2023. Relevant portion of the said order is as under:

"In continuation of this office letter no. 18791/X-III/SHD District, dated 01/09/2025 on the subject cited above, it is further clarified regarding point no. 02, that 02 application were received from Sh. Ram Kumar Rana and Sh. Tej Prakash for holding Ramleela at above mentioned place during the year 2023 but both were rejected due to pending case in the Hon'ble court. Further, Delhi High Court permitted to Sh. Tej Parkash (Yamuna Kamal Club) to hold Ramleela in the judgment of W.P.(C) 12316/2023 & CM No. 48511.2023 & 52325/2023 dated 18.10.2023. After that Ramleela was organized by Sh. Tej Parkash (Yamuna Kamal Club) only at the end of Dushera Fasival i.e. 24-10-2023."



21. Insofar as respondent no.2's contention that in the year 2023, the petitioner did not stage Ramleela, suffice it to note that SOP of the DDA does not make it a pre-condition. Further, partial staging of Ramleela and organizing Dussehra festival in the year 2023 has satisfactorily been explained by the learned counsel for the petitioner, as noted in para 7 above.

22. As regards the allegation of black-listing and forfeiture of security deposit of the petitioner for the year 2024, the said allegations have not been supported by the DDA, nor any such order of black-listing or forfeiture has been brought on record.

23. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed. Respondent no.1/DDA is directed to accept the Booking Application of the petitioner for holding Ramleela Celebrations/Functions for the year 2025 at the subject site/Plot Nos. EZ-68B & EZ-68C with a total area measuring 6585 sq. mtrs., both part of GTB Ground, Opposite GTB Hospital, Delhi-110093.

24. Further, any amounts received by the DDA for booking of the said plots from respondent no.2 for the present year 2025 be returned to it.

25. The petition alongwith pending applications is disposed of in the above terms.

26. Order *dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 18, 2025

SSC