



\$~6

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4898/2024& CM APPL. 19982/2024**

ABDUL RASHID

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Brijendra Pratap Singh, Adv.

versus

FAZLU REHMAN & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Medhanshu Tripathi, Mr. Tushar Tokas, Ms. Arvinder Kaur, Ms. Aditi Singh, Mr. Manas Rai, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **09.01.2026**

CM APPL. 19982/2024 (for delay in refilling the petition)

1. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and the delay of 61 days in re-filing the petition stands condoned.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 4898/2024

1. The petitioner in the instant petition has prayed for the following directions:

*"i) Issue an appropriate Writ or order/direction in the nature of Mandamus thereby directing the respondents no.4 to stop the respondents no.1 to 3 from doing business at the phar/auction platform no.1 in New Sabzi Mandi, Okhla, New Delhi, situated in the market area in violation of Agricultural Produce Marketing (Regulation) Act, 1998 and rules thereof;
ii) Issue an appropriate Writ or order/direction in the nature of Mandamus*



thereby directing the respondent no.4 to take necessary steps for preventing further illegal business activities in violation of Agricultural Produce Marketing (Regulation) Act, 1998 and rules thereof.

iii) Such other and further relief may also be granted in favour of the petitioner against the respondents as deemed just and proper according to the circumstances of the case.”

2. The petitioner claims to be a licensed wholesale trader operating from Shop no. 76, Okhla Subzi Mandi, New Delhi-110020 and was allotted half portion of Phar (Auction platform) by respondent no.4-Agricultural Produce Market Committee.
3. The petitioner submits that during Covid-19, respondent No.1 illegally encroached upon the petitioner's allotted auction platform. He also submits that respondent No.1 in turn, inducted respondent Nos.2 and 3, who are operating their business unlawfully.
4. The petitioner claims to have made a complaint to respondent No.4 and as submitted by Ms. Aliza Alam, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.4, the preliminary inquiry was conducted in the presence of the stakeholders and the appropriate steps are being taken to ensure that the petitioner's grievance is taken to its logical end. During the course of hearing, she has also shown the Court the preliminary inquiry report dated 11.09.2024.
5. What transpires is that no formal order has been communicated to the petitioner regarding the outcome of his complaint.
6. Under these circumstances, the Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with the directions to respondent No.4 to decide the petitioner's grievance and to take it to its logical end within a period of four months from today.
7. In case, the petitioner thereafter has any grievance, he shall be at



liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

8. The petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J
JANUARY 9, 2026/P/AP