



\$~41

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2775/2025**

**MEENA BAZAR STREET VENDORS HAWKERS SANGATHAN
AND ORS**Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sushant Pal and Mohd. Asif,
Adv.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Gaurav Mishra, CGSC with Mr.
Navneet Dubey, Adv. for UOI
Ms. Puja S. Kalra, SC with Mr.
Virendra Singh, Adv. for MCD

**CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE MADHU JAIN**

ORDER
% **02.02.2026**

1. This hearing has been through hybrid mode.
2. The Petitioners in this case are Tasleem Khan, Radhey Shyam Gupta, Jamal Khan and Deepak Gupta who have filed the petition through Mr. Haider Ali, President of the Petitioner No. 1 Association - Meena Bazar Street Vendors Hawkers Sangathan & Ors. (hereinafter "*the Association*").
3. Firstly, considering the nature of the matter, the Association could not have been made a party as the petition has not been filed on behalf of the Association or all of its members, but only in respect of the four members who are arrayed as Petitioner Nos. 2 to 5.
4. The case of the Petitioners is that they are hawking at the vending site



located at City SP Zone, Ward-N-85, Jama Masjid, Delhi - 11006 by operating kiosks and stalls and selling items such as tea, food as also clothing.

5. The details of the respective Certificate of Vending (hereinafter “CoV”) that have been issued to the Petitioners is as under:

NAME OF THE VENDOR/ PETITIONER	DATE OF ISSUANCE OF COV	PLACE OF VENDING	VENDING CERTIFICATE (URI)	CATEGORY OF COV
Tasleem Khan (Petitioner No. 2)	31.01.2022	City SP Zone, Ward 85-N	2176420	Others
Radhey Shyam Gupta (Petitioner No. 3)	03.02.2022	City SP Zone, Ward 85-N	8149834	Others
Jamal Khan (Petitioner No. 4)	31.01.2022	City SP Zone, Ward 85-N	9880527	Others
Deepak Gupta (Petitioner No. 5)	03.02.2022	City SP Zone, Ward 85-N	7677189	Others

6. The submission on behalf of the Petitioners is that they ought to be allowed to peacefully vend in the subject vending area without any disturbance from the Respondents.

7. Ms. Kalra, Id. Counsel for the Petitioners submits that the Petitioners have participated in the survey and the same has already concluded. It is further submitted that condition no. 11 i.e., “*Mobile vendors shall not stay or vend more than 30 minutes or time prescribed by the TVC at place in a vending/squatting zone*” would have to be complied with by the Petitioners. She also points out that Sh. Radhey Shyam Gupta and Sh. Deepak Gupta are father and son, and therefore, they cannot operate separate vends as one family is entitled to only one vend.

8. The Court has considered the matter. The survey having now been completed, and the Petitioners having already participated, the Petitioners shall be bound by the result of the survey as also any decision that may be



taken by the TVC in respect of all the vending zones as also relocation.

9. Till the time the TVC takes the decision, the Petitioners shall not be disturbed so long as they adhere to the conditions of the certificates of vending.

10. Insofar as the issue of one vend for one family is concerned, let the TVC take a decision which shall be binding on the Petitioners.

11. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Pending application, if any, is also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J

MADHU JAIN, J

FEBRUARY 2, 2026/ys/msh