



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 30.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

W.A(MD) No.193 of 2026
and
C.M.P(MD)No.1995 of 2026

- 1.Mohamed Yusuf
- 2.Sarubudeen
- 3.Syed Mustafa
- 4.Mohamed Rasool
- 5.Arunkumar
- 6.Amarjothi
- 7.Rajendran
- 8.Abdul Nayeem
- 9.Mohankumar
- 10.Balasubramani
- 11.Radha
- 12.Subramanian
- 13.Puhalendhi
- 14.Syed Samsudeen
- 15.Kathalingam
- 16.Sudarshan
- 17.Ravichandran
- 18.Rengabalan
- 19.Nagoor Meeran
- 20.Yasudeen
- 21.Selvakumar
- 22.Dinesh Kumar
- 23.Syed Abudahir



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

WEB COPY

24.Zakir Hussain
25.Abdul Rasif
26.Akbar Khan
27.Tajdeen
28.Ismail
29.Karthikeyan
30.Salavudeen
31.Mohammed Raja
32.Thangavel
33.Akila
34.Abbas
35.Sunitha Begum
36.Anburaj
37.Murugesan
38.Chinnaponnu
39.Mohamed Ibrahim
40.Mohammed Hanifa

... Appellants/Writ Petitioners

-VS-

1.The Commissioner,
Trichy Municipal Corporation, Trichy.

2.The Chair Person,
Town Vending Committee, Trichy Municipal Corporation,
Trichy. ... Respondents/Respondents

Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent to set aside the order, dated 29.01.2026 passed in W.P.(MD)No.1044 of 2026 on the file of this Court.

For Appellants	: Mr.B.Jameel Arasu
For R – 1	: Mr.R.Baskaran Additional Advocate General for M/s.R.B.Law Associates
For R – 2	: Mr.A.Baskaran Additional Government Pleader



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

WEB COPY

J U D G M E N T

[Judgment of the Court was delivered by N.SATHISH KUMAR, J]

Challenging the order of the writ court dated 29.01.2026 passed in W.P(MD)No.1044 of 2026, whereby the writ petition filed by the petitioners was dismissed, the present Writ Appeal has been filed.

2.The Writ Petition was originally filed seeking a writ of Mandamus forbearing the respondents from, in any manner, dispossessing or evicting the writ petitioners from their present place of street vending at N.S.B. Road, Trichy, till the completion of the survey as contemplated under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act, 2014”).

3.The learned Single Judge, taking into consideration the fact that a resolution had been passed by the Street Vending Committee declaring the area as a non-vending zone and that the writ petitioners had been put on notice of such resolution, dismissed the Writ Petition.



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

WEB COPY

4.The learned counsel appearing for the appellants mainly contended that no procedure, as contemplated under Section 3 of the Act, 2014, had been followed and no survey had been conducted by the Committee. However, the writ petitioners were dispossessed from the place. Hence, there is a clear violation by the authorities and their possession ought to be restored.

5.Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents submitted that the area had already been declared as a non-vending zone by a resolution passed by the Committee, of which the writ petitioners were also aware. It is further submitted that all vendors have been relocated to alternative places, and the appellants/writ petitioners have also been identified as street vendors and accommodated in nearby locations. Therefore, as a matter of right, the appellants/writ petitioners cannot seek restoration of possession in the same place which has already been declared as a non-vending zone.



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

WEB COPY

6.Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7.The very prayer in the Writ Petition is in the nature of an injunction restraining the authorities from evicting the petitioners; however, eviction has already been carried out. It is not in dispute that the appellants/writ petitioners have been recognised as street vendors. It also appears that alternative places have been allotted to them. The grievance of the appellants appears to be with regard to the inconvenience caused in the newly allotted places.

8.We are of the view that such inconvenience faced by the street vendors cannot be a ground to direct restoration to the original place. The Committee has been vested with the discretion to regulate and allot vending places. As a matter of right, no individual can insist on being permitted to vend at a particular place. While allotting places to street vendors, various factors have to be considered, including access, public convenience, and the rights of others. Therefore, it is for the Committee to decide the places where such licences are to be granted.



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

WEB COPY

9.We do not find any merit in the Writ Appeal. However, it is brought to our notice that the representations of the appellants/writ petitioners are pending before the Committee. The appellants/writ petitioners are also permitted to submit fresh representations, if any, within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Upon receipt of such representations, the Committee shall consider and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of one month thereafter.

10.With the above directions, the Writ Appeal is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

[SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI, C.J.]

[N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.]

30.03.2026

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

ps



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

To

1.The Commissioner,
Trichy Municipal Corporation,
Trichy.

2.The Chair Person,
Town Vending Committee,
Trichy Municipal Corporation,
Trichy.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD) No.193 of 2026

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

ps

W.A(MD)No.193 of 2026

30.03.2026