



\$~136

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010467212026
+ **W.P.(C) 14360/2026**
SHRI SANATAN DHARAM RAMLEELA SAMITI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dhruv Chawla, Mr. Manish
Tanwar, Ms. Kanika Singhal, Mr. Vipul Saini, Mr.
Mohit Tomar and Mr. Nikhil Mann, Advs
versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC with
Mr.Chirag Sharma, Adv Aman Kumar for DDA
Adv Puneet Dhwani and Mr. Adv Anish
Ahmad for R4
Mr. Sumit K. Batra and Ms. Priyanka Jindal,
Advocates for GNCTD
Mr. Manu Chaturvedi Adv Standing Counsel for
MCD

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

%

28.09.2026

CM APPL. 67254/2026

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application is disposed of.

W.P.(C) 14360/2026

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs :-

“A. Issue an appropriate Writ, Order and / or direction



thereby setting aside / quashing the cancellation of the Petitioner's online booking request bearing Request ID/Challan No. 958849 for the subject park and direct the Respondent No. 1 / DDA to lawfully reconsider the booking request of the Petitioner and perform its statutory duties.

B. Direct the Respondent to reconsider and decide the Petitioner's booking request for the period 30.09.2026 to 25.10.2026, particularly in accordance with the applicable DDA policy/SOP, the actual orders passed by this Hon'ble Court in W.P.(C) 36/2026 and all other applicable statutory and regulatory requirements;

C. Pending disposal of the present Writ Petition, direct the Respondent No. 1 to keep the Petitioner's booking request for the subject park alive/under consideration and not reject / refuse the same solely based on an alleged blanket prohibition arising from the orders passed in W.P.(C) 36/2026..."

2. For the reasons stated in the petition, issue notice.
3. Ms. Tripathy, learned standing counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1/ DDA. Mr. Chaturvedi, learned standing counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2/ MCD. Mr. Batra, learned learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 3/ GNCTD. Mr. Dhawan, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 4/ Station House Officer.
4. It is the case of the petitioner that it has been organising the annual Ramlila at Chintoo Park, Naraina for several decades with the requisite permissions and NOCs from the concerned authorities. The petitioner



contends that its booking of the park for the period from 30.09.2026 to 25.10.2026 was arbitrarily cancelled by the DDA on 09.09.2026 with the sole remark “Cancelled due to Hon’ble High Court Directions”, without notice, hearing or reasons.

5. According to the petitioner, the orders passed in W.P.(C.) No. 36/2026, *Lalit Anand v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi & Ors.*, merely concern removal of encroachments, prevention of parking and maintenance of the park as a green area and do not prohibit the Ramlila or religious functions at the site. Hence the present petition.

6. Ms. Tripathy, learned standing counsel for DDA, states that pursuant to the order dated 05.01.2026 passed in W.P. (C) 36/2026, Chintoo Park is being used as a park for the welfare of residents of Naraina Vihar Colony, which is evident from the Status Report handed over in Court today in W.P(C) No. 36/2026. She has also shown me photographs regarding the same.

7. I am of the view that, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the requirement of maintaining Chintoo Park as a green and recreational space for the welfare of the residents of Naraina Vihar must take precedence over its temporary use for conducting the Ramlila.

8. The orders passed in W.P.(C.) No. 36/2026 were issued in the context of the condition of the park, including the encroachments and other unauthorised uses, and directed its restoration and maintenance for the benefit of the residents of the locality. The subsequent order dated 19.08.2026 further directed that, till the land is put to its allotted use i.e., community centre/ old age home, the respondents shall maintain the same as a green area.



9. The proposed Ramlila, though sought to be conducted for a limited period and notwithstanding the petitioner's willingness to comply with the requisite conditions, would necessarily entail temporary occupation and use of the park by a large number of persons, together with the installation and use of structures and facilities associated with the event. Such use cannot be considered in isolation from the purpose for which the park is presently required to be maintained.

10. The fact that the petitioner has conducted the event at the same site in previous years, or that permissions may have been granted on earlier occasions, cannot override the subsequent directions issued by this Court for restoration and maintenance of the park for the welfare of the residents.

11. The submission of the petitioner that the Ramlila would be confined to the existing stage area and would not permanently alter or encroach upon the park also does not alter the position. The issue before the Court is not about permanent damage to the green area, but whether the proposed temporary use of the site is consistent with the manner in which the park is presently required to be maintained pursuant to the orders passed in W.P.(C.) No. 36/2026.

12. In such a situation, this Court is therefore required to balance the petitioner's request to conduct the Ramlila against the larger requirement of maintaining the park for the welfare and use of the residents of Naraina Vihar. In the facts of the present case, the latter requirement outweighs the petitioner's claim for temporary use of the park. Consequently, no direction can be issued permitting the petitioner to conduct the Ramlila at the subject park during the period in question.

13. Needless to add that there are plenty of other grounds available for



conducting Ramlila as informed to the Court by the learned Standing Counsel for DDA.

14. For the aforesaid reasons, I do not find any reason to entertain the petition and the same is dismissed.

JASMEET SINGH, J

SEPTEMBER 28, 2026/NR