



\$~113

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 14613/2025**
SHREE GANESH RAMLEEELA COMMITTEE (REGD)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Krishan Kumar, Advocate.

versus

DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Manika Tripathi, Standing
Counsel for DDA with Mr. Aakash Mohar,
Advocate for R1.

Mr. Manu Nayar, Advocate for R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

19.09.2025

CM. APPL. 59928/2025

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 14613/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by petitioner seeking following reliefs:

“a) Issue appropriate writ(s), order(s) or direction(s) in the nature of a writ of appropriate writ(s), order(s) or direction(s) in the nature of writ of Certiorari thereby quash and set aside the impugned Emails (six) dated 11.09.2025 and 15.09.2025 sent by Respondent No.1 and a writ of mandamus in the nature of writ(s), order(s) or direction(s) thereby directing respondent No.1 to immediately cancel the booking allotted to respondent No.2 on 16.09.2025 in respect of Plot No. EZ-I09 and EZ-II0, Shastri Park, Delhi and allot these two plots to the petitioner society for conducting Ramleela, 2025”

4. The case set out in the present petition is that petitioner Society



through its President Sh. Baldev Raj Sharma had booked two open spaces of respondent no.1/DDA bearing plot nos. EZ-109 and EZ-110 [hereinafter referred to as ‘open space’] on 20.08.2025 for conducting Ramleela-2025 for the period from 20.09.2025 to 05.10.2025 and had deposited requisite security deposit through online portal of respondent no.1/DDA.

5. Insofar as respondent no.2 is concerned, it had booked four plots in total, one plot was booked on 17.08.2025; two plots were booked on 21.08.2025 and yet another plot was booked on 04.09.2025 [all four plots are hereinafter referred to as the ‘site’]

6. Mr. Krishan Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner has invited attention of the Court to the payment challan bearing no. 952127 dated 20.08.2025 issued by the respondent no.1/DDA, which shows that open space was booked by Baldev Raj Sharma, who is President of Sh. Ganesh Ramleela Committee, petitioner herein.

7. He submits that booking was subsequently cancelled on 15.09.2025 without any justification and the same open space, which had been booked by petitioner, was allotted on the very next day i.e. on 16.09.2025 to the respondent no.2.

8. He submits that both petitioner as well as respondent no.2 had never organized Ramleela at the given ‘open space’ during the two years out of last three years in terms of the SOP dated 14.08.2025. The relevant part of the SOP dated 14.08.2025 to which attention of the Court has been drawn reads thus:

“2. Societies/Trusts which were continuously booking the respective 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.”

9. He submits that after the space was booked in the name of the President of the petitioner, it has further spent an amount to the extent of Rs.6.5 Lacs in making preparations. He submits that cancellation at the last moment on 15.09.2025, when the Ramleela is scheduled to commence on 22.09.2025, is arbitrary and unjustified.

10. In view of the above, issue notice.

11. Ms. Manika Tripathy, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.1/DDA accepts notice. Likewise, Mr. Manu Nayar, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.2.

12. Ms. Tripathy submits that when the said controversy arose between the petitioner and the respondent no. 2, matter was referred to the Grievance Redressal Committee, where a representation was received from respondent no.2 along with a letter of the DCP of the concerned area, stating that respondent no.2 had organized Ramleela at the given ‘site’.

13. On a query posed by the Court as to whether at the ‘open space’ or at given ‘site’, any booking was done by the DDA in favour of the respondent no.2 for two years out of last three years in terms of the SOP, her answer is in negative.

14. She further clarifies, that the said site was handed over to Gawar Construction for Delhi-Dehradun Highway Project, but confusion arose on account of communication of the DCP furnished by the respondent no.2.

15. It thus, appears that the DDA had neither booked the ‘open space’ or the ‘site’ either in favour of the petitioner or in favour of the respondent no.2 for two years out of last three years, therefore, there was no reason for the



DDA to give preference to respondent no.2 over the petitioner only on the basis of some communication of DCP, contrary to its own records.

16. Further, this Court finds that ‘the space’ had been booked by the petitioner well in advance on 20.08.2025, therefore, respondent no.1 ought not to have cancelled the same at a belated stage i.e. on 15.09.2025, by which time the petitioner, based on such booking, must have spent substantial amount in making arrangements, as the Ramleela’s are going to commence on 22.09.2025.

17. Therefore, cancellation of petitioner’s booking and subsequent allotment of ‘the space’ in favour of respondent no.2 cannot be sustained.

18. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. Consequently, booking of ‘the space’ in favour of respondent no.2 is quashed and the one in favour of the petitioner is restored.

19. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

13. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the Signatures of Court Master.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 19, 2025/jg