



2026:DHC:8706-DB



\$~53 to 61

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

Date of decision: 28th September, 2026.

Uploaded on: 5th October, 2026.

+

CONT.CAS(C) 703/2021

FEDERATION OF NEHRU PLACE ASSOCIATIONSPetitioner

Through: Mr. Pranav Proothi, Ms. Manasi Chatpalliwar, Mr. Anshveer Singh Nalwa and Mr. Anany Singh, Advs.

versus

GYANESH BHARTI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms. Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar Advs.

Mr. Amit Singh Chaddha, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Sujata Kashyap and Ms. Ishika Rawat, Advs. for R3-R25

Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv. Standing counsel of SDMC along with Ms Bhawna, Adv.

~54

+ **W.P.(C) 6823/2017 & CM APPL. 28389/2017, CM APPL. 28390/2017, CM APPL. 29267/2017**

PREMVATI AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amit Singh Chaddha, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Sujata Kashyap and Ms. Ishika Rawat, Advs.

versus

SOUTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv. Standing counsel of SDMC along with Ms Bhawna, Adv.

Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel Counsel, GNCTD with Ms. Rashi Aggarwal,



2026:DHC:8706-DB



Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms. Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar Advs.

Mr. Amit Singh Chaddha, Sr. Adv. with Ms. Sujata Kashyap and Ms. Ishika Rawat, Advs.

Mr. Sagar Khanna, SO, RCS.

~55

+ **W.P.(C) 7307/2017 & CM APPL. 30250/2017, CM APPL. 11548/2026**

KANTI DEVI & ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Anamika Ghai and Ms. Kirti Bhardwaj, Advocates.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv. Standing counsel of SDMC along with Ms Bhawna, Adv.

Mr. Mukesh Gupta, SC for MCD, Ms. Sneha Roy & Ms. Madhu Yadav, Advs.

Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms. Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar Advs.

Mr. Lalltaksh Joshi & Ms. Minu kumari, Advs. for GNCTD.

~56

+ **W.P.(C) 7405/2017 & CM APPL. 30590/2017**

VIPIN NARANG & ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Anamika Ghai and Ms. Kirti Bhardwaj, Advocates.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

.....Respondents

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By:DHIRENDER KUMAR
Signing Date:05.10.2026
16:58:56

CONT.CAS(C) 703/2021 & other connected matters

Page 2 of 45



2026:DHC:8706-DB



Through: Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms. Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar Advs.
Mr. T.P. Singh, SPC for Delhi Police
Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv.
Standing counsel of SDMC along with Ms Bhawna, Adv.
Mr. Lalitaksh Joshi & Ms. Minu kumari, Advs. for GNCTD.

~57

+

W.P.(C) 9611/2017 & CM APPL. 39135/2017
SUNDRI DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amit Singh Chaddha, Sr. Adv.
with Ms. Sujata Kashyap and Ms. Ishika Rawat, Advs.

versus

**THE STATE & ORS (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) &
ORS**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel Counsel,
GNCTD with Mr. Rashmi Aggarwal,
Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms. Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar Advs.

Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv.
Standing counsel of SDMC along with Ms Bhawna, Adv.

~58

+

W.P.(C) 8430/2021 & CM APPL. 27831/2021, CM APPL. 27833/2021, CM APPL. 3699/2022, CM APPL. 5935/2022, CM APPL. 10811/2022, CM APPL. 11085/2022, CM APPL. 11125/2022, CM APPL. 11139/2022, CM APPL. 19730/2022, CM APPL. 29807/2025



2026:DHC:8706-DB



COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Indira Unninayar, Adv. with Mr.
Kumar Aryan, Advocate.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Urvi Mohan, Adv.
Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv.
Standing counsel of SDMC along with
Ms Bhawna, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja
Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind
Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms.
Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar
Advs.
Ms. Aakansha Kaul, Mr. Aman
Sohani, Ms. Ashima Chopra ad Mr.
Saptarishi Sharma, Advs. for DJB
Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC with Ms.
Ayushi Srivastava Mr. Arpan Narwal,
Mr. Ayush Tanwar and Mr. Kushagra
Malik, Advs. for UOI
Mr. Arjun Pant, Adv. for DDA
Mr. Mohd. Faisal, Adv.
Ms. Mahika Bisht, Adv. for Ms. Urvi
Mohan, Adv. for GNCTD.
Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Mishra, Ms.
Shivani Verma, Ms. Renu & Ms.
Akanksha Priya, Advs.
Mr. Pranav Proothi, Ms. Manasi
Chatpalliwar , Mr. Anshveer Singh
Nalwa and Mr. Anany Singh, Advs.
for Applicant.
Insp Ajay Kumar.
SI Kailash Chand for State.
SI. Ashok Kumar, Pairvi Officer
SI Sonu Nain Traffic KKC Circle
9868083331

~59



2026:DHC:8706-DB



+

W.P.(C) 10880/2020 & CM APPL. 5836/2023**RAHUL KUMAR & ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rushikanta Dash and Mr.
Shubham Dubey, Adv.

versus

**STATION HOUSE OFFICER KALKAJI POLICE STATION.
&ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Saket, SPCG, Mr.
Manish Madhukar, Mr. Abhigyan, Ms.
Reya Paul, Ms. Nidhi Singh, Ms.
Amruta Padhi, Adv. for SHO, Kalkaji
Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja
Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind
Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms.
Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar
Adv.Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv.
Standing counsel of SDMC along with
Ms Bhawna, Adv.Ms. Vaishali Gupta, Panel Counse(
Civil) GNCTD , Ms. Rashi Aggarwal,
Adv.

~60

+

W.P.(C) 6221/2022**KALKAJI CIVIL SOCIETY**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Khusboo Kohli, Adv.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.RespondentsThrough: Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv.
Standing counsel of SDMC along with
Ms Bhawna, Adv.Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja
Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind
Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms.
Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar
Adv.

Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC with Ms.



2026:DHC:8706-DB



Ayushi Srivastava, Mr. Arpan Narwal,
Mr. Ayush Tanwar and Mr. Kushagra
Malik, Advs. for UOI

~61

+

W.P.(C) 2183/2026 & CM APPL. 10577/2026

MANUSHI SANGATHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Indira Unniayar, Adv. with Mr.
Kumar Aryan, Advocate.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI &
ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu, Mr. Parvin Bansal
with Mr. Vaibhav Tripathi, Advs. for
DDA.
Mr. Sanjay Poddar Sr. Adv, Ms. Puja
Kalra, Mr. Viren Singh, Mr. Govind
Kumar, Mr. Apurv Kumar, Ms.
Anshika Singh & Mr. Ankit Kakkar
Advs.
Mr. G.M. Akhtar and Ms. Saba M.
Zaidi, Advs. for R3
Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra, Adv.
Standing counsel of SDMC along with
Ms Bhawna, Adv.

CORAM:**JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH****JUSTICE DINESH BHATT****JUDGMENT****Prathiba M. Singh, J.**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. These are various matters relating to vending and hawking in the Nehru Place area. Since several years, the Nehru Place area has become a severe bone of contention for hawkers and vendors.
3. ***CONT. CAS(C) 703/2021*** has been filed by Federation of Nehru Place



Association alleging wilful and deliberate disobedience of the directions issued *vide* order dated 19th September, 2017 in ***W.P.(C) 6823/2017***.

4. ***W.P.(C) 6823/2017*** has been filed by 23 vendors, *inter alia*, seeking directions to the Respondents to allow the Petitioners to peacefully vend from their vending sites.

5. ***W.P.(C) 7307/2017*** has been filed by 2 vendors, *inter alia*, seeking directions to the Respondents to allow the Petitioners to peacefully vend from their vending sites.

6. ***W.P.(C) 7405/2017*** has been filed by 4 vendors, *inter alia*, seeking directions to the Respondents to allow the Petitioners to peacefully vend from their vending sites.

7. ***W.P.(C) 9611/2017*** has been filed by Ms. Sundri Devi, *inter alia*, seeking directions to the Respondents to allow the Petitioner to peacefully vend from her vending site.

8. ***W.P.(C) 10880/2020*** has been filed by 15 vendors, *inter alia*, seeking directions to the Respondents to allow the Petitioners to peacefully vend from their vending sites.

9. ***W.P. (C) 6221/2022*** has been filed by Kalkaji Civil Society through its Chairman, Sh. Khavinder Singh Captain, *inter alia*, seeking the following prayer:

“i) Issue a writ nature of Mandamus to direct the Respondent No.2 not to shift 67 hawkers of the "Manushi Sangathan" to area opposite Aggarwal Dharamshala, near Govindpuri metro station, New Delhi- 110019 or permit them to hawk there as was granted by Respondent No. 2 by way of the Administrative Order dated 13.01.2022, bearing no. AC/CNZ/202211204 passed by the Respondent



No. 2 not permit the vendors/hawkers to hawk at area Opposite Aggarwal Dharamshala, Near Govindpuri Metro Station, New Delhi- 110019.”

10. ***W.P.(C) 2183/2026*** has been filed by Manushi Sangathan, which is an organisation that espouses causes for the urban poor such as street vendors and cycle rickshaw pullers, *inter alia*, seeking issuance of an appropriate writ for protection of Fundamental Rights and for declaring the Nehru Place District Centre as a ‘Vending Zone’.

11. One of the first judgments passed by a Division Bench of this Court regarding the Nehru Place area was ***Manushi Sangathan v. Delhi Development Authority & Ors., 2009 (110) DRJ 87 (DB)*** wherein, the Court had in paragraphs 38, 39 and 40 recognized the rights of vendors and had observed that 67 vendors would be permitted to vend in the Nehru Place area. The said judgment was passed following the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Sudhir Madan and Ors. v. Municipal Corporation of Delhi and Ors., 2007 (8) SCALE 334***. The relevant portions of the decision in ***Manushi Sangathan (Supra)*** is set out below:-

“38. The National Policy on Urban Street Vendors incorporates and proceeds on the basis of the guidelines and directions issued by the Supreme Court. Additional safeguards and protection to vendors and regulations have been provided. Exercise of discretion is regulated by clear guidelines and principles to be followed. We have also quoted above directions of the Supreme Court in the Order dated 6th February, 2007 in Sudhir Madan and others v. MCD and others making reference to the National Policy on Urban Street Vendors and holding, inter alia, that an existing allottee can be shifted from one site to another but



consistent with the said Policy which provides that eviction should be avoided, unless there is clear and urgent public need. It also states that the allottee before shifting would be given an opportunity to give his preference. There was no need for such haste and hurry on the part of the DDA to remove hawkers under the pilot project. We may also note here that DDA has not made any allegation that the appellant-NGO or any of their hawkers had violated the terms of the pilot project or the undertakings given or the said appellant-NGO had misused or abused the permission for controlled and regulated hawking in Nehru Place. During the course of hearing before us, it was pointed out that DDA took the said action as other hawkers had filed litigations claiming parity with permission granted to the appellant-NGO for regulated hawking. Controlled and regulated hawking under the pilot project cannot be equated with unregulated hawking contrary to the terms of the policy/scheme and directions of the Supreme Court. Scrapping of the pilot project and removing the Hawkers without notice and in the manner stated above was arbitrary.

39. In view of the above findings, it is clear that the respondents and specially DDA have not followed guidelines of the Supreme Court, Master Plan of Delhi- 2021, guidelines laid down in the National Policy on Urban Street Vendors and the scheme of MCD for squatters/hawkers-2007. These aspects were not examined and considered before evicting the vendors under the pilot project at Nehru Place. As already stated above, the decision taken in the meeting held on 18th April, 2002 does not support the contention that Nehru place is a non-hawking Zone. It is also apparent that the respondent-DDA has acted illegally in removing the hawkers operating under the pilot project and who were



complying with the imposed terms and indulging in regulated hawking.

40. In view of the above findings, we dispose of the present Letters Patent Appeal by directing DDA to continue with the pilot project. Accordingly, 67 vendors (reduced to 67 from 68 as per the statement made by the appellant-NGO) will be permitted to hawk in the area which was demarcated by DDA prior to their removal on 19th April, 2008. However, it will be open to DDA to examine whether Nehru Place or the said area should be declared a non-hawking area and if required, demarcate vending/non-vending areas in Nehru Place. Removal/shifting of the hawkers under the pilot project, if required, will be in terms of the directions issued by the Supreme Court in the case of Sudhir Madan (supra). The question whether Nehru Place should be declared a no hawking zone and the question of demarcating non-vending areas will be decided by the DDA after making reference to the Ward Vending Committee and on the basis of the directions issued by the Supreme Court and in terms of the Scheme of the MCD. We may note that MCD has stated that they had already allotted alternative site to some hawkers out of the list of 67 street vendors. If any of said hawkers have already opted for the new site, they will not be entitled to the benefit of this Order. The Appeal is accordingly allowed to the extent indicated above.”

12. *Vide Manushi Sangathan (Supra)*, passed on 17th April, 2009, the Division Bench permitted 67 hawkers to vend and the Delhi Development Authority (hereinafter, ‘DDA’) was directed to examine as to whether Nehru Place area was to be declared as a ‘No-hawking zone’ or not. Accordingly, the DDA had to take a decision after making a reference to the Ward Vending Committee.



13. This decision was challenged before the Supreme Court by the DDA wherein *vide* order dated 25th April 2011 in ***Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No. 29277/2009 titled ‘Delhi Development Authority v. Manushi Sangathan & Ors.’***, benefit was granted to the said hawkers on the basis of an affidavit dated 7th December, 2010 filed by Shri S.R. Solanki, Chief Engineer, South Zone DDA. The said order passed by the Supreme Court reads as under:-

*“This petition is directed against order dated 17.04.2009 of the Division Bench of the Delhi High Court, the operative portion of which reads thus:
"In view of the above findings, we dispose of the present Letters Patent Appeal by directing DDA to continue with the pilot project. Accordingly, 67 vendors (reduced to 67 from 68 as per the statement made by the appellant-NGO) will be permitted to hawk in the area which was demarcated by DDA prior to their removal on 19th April, 2008. However, it will be open to DDA to examine whether Nehru Place or the said area should be declared a non-hawking area and if required, demarcate vending/non-vending areas in Nehru Place. Removal/shifting of the hawkers under the pilot project, if required, will be in terms of the directions issued by the Supreme Court in the case of Sudhir Madan (supra). The question whether Nehru Place should be declared as no hawking zone and the question of demarcating non-vending areas will be decided by the DDA after making reference to the Ward Vending Committee and on the basis of the directions issued by the Supreme Court and in terms of the Scheme of the MCD. We may note that MCD has stated that they had already allotted alternative site to some hawkers out of the list of 67 street vendors. If any of said hawkers have already opted for the new site, they will not be entitled to the*



benefit of this Order. The Appeal is accordingly allowed to the extent indicated above."

Arguments in the case were heard on different dates and the judgment was reserved on 26.10.2010. Thereafter, the parties filed written submissions and some affidavits. In paragraph 5 of affidavit dated 07.12.2010, Shri S.R.Solanki, Chief Engineer, South Zone, Delhi Development Authority, has made the following statement :-

"5. The Petitioner authority also submits that as an interim measure and till such time, the ward vending committee takes a decision on the eligibility and relocation of the 67 hawkers under the umbrella of the respondent No.1 and other 85 hawkers sitting under various orders of different courts at Delhi, the Petitioner authority shall not take any coercive action to remove these persons. However, the Petitioner authority also submits that the same may not been 3 taken as a concession on behalf of the Petitioner authority to give up its case of the NPDC being declared as No Hawking Zone or an admission on the part of the Petitioner authority for other hawkers to use Nehru Place District centre as hawking site."

In our opinion, the stand taken in the above reproduced paragraph of the affidavit of Shri Solanki is in consonance with the direction given by the Division Bench of the High Court. Therefore, the special leave petition is disposed of as infructuous.

The direction given in I.A.No.4 of 2011 for imposition of cost of Rs.50,000/- is deleted."

14. Thus, the 67 hawkers along with few other hawkers continue to hawk in the Nehru Place area. The Municipal Corporation of Delhi (hereinafter, 'MCD') continued to take objections to hawking in the Nehru Place area which led to two more orders of this Court i.e., order dated 7th September,



2017 in *W.P. (C) 2566/2017* titled '*Bachchu Singh & Anr. v. South Delhi Municipal Corp. & Ors.*' and order dated 2nd April, 2018 in *LPA 623/2016* titled '*Federation of Nehru Place Association (Regd) v. South Delhi Municipal Corporation Thr its Commissioner & Ors.*'.

15. In *Bachchu Singh & Ors. (Supra)*, the Division Bench of this Court was concerned with the Petitioners therein who were seeking permission to vend at the Skylark building in the Nehru Place area. In the said decision, the Division Bench considered the earlier decision in *Manushi Sangathan v. Delhi Development Authority & Ors. (Supra)* and the affidavit filed by the DDA before the Supreme Court in *Delhi Development Authority v. Manushi Sangathan & Ors. (Supra)*. In addition, the Division Bench in the said decision also considered the minutes of meeting which took place post the judgment passed in *Manushi Sangathan v. Delhi Development Authority & Ors. (Supra)*.

16. The said minutes of meeting dated 10th August, 2009 resulted in the decision of the DDA that Nehru Place District Centre should be declared as a 'No-hawking zone'. This was also confirmed by the then Lieutenant Governor of Delhi, who was the Chairman of the DDA. In *Bachchu Singh (Supra)*, the Court then came to the following conclusions:-

"21. Taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties, we are of the view that the DDA, erstwhile land owning agency, and the SDMC, have taken a consistent stand that Nehru Place District Centre has been declared as a No Hawking and No Vending Zone, however, while deciding LPA No.766/2008 a Division Bench of this Court while disposing of the LPA directed to continue with the pilot project and the appellant-NGO Vendors of Manushi were



permitted to hawk in the area demarcated by the DDA. It was left open to the DDA to examine whether Nehru Place or the said area should be declared a no hawking area. After the passing of the order by the Division Bench on 17.4.2009, the matter was considered by the DDA in the meeting held on 10.8.2009. The Minutes of the meeting have been extracted. The minutes were duly confirmed. Subsequently as stated in the affidavit filed before the Supreme Court of India, protection was granted in the LPA only to members of Manushi Sangathan and certain other street vendors who were enjoying protection of orders passed by different Courts. The names of both the petitioners do not find mentioned in either of the list prepared by Thareja Committee, 1992 or Chopra Committee. Resultantly, we find no merit in the present writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.”

17. As can be seen from the above, it becomes clear that in ***Bachchu Singh (Supra)***, the Court put its imprimatur on the decision of the DDA to declare Nehru Place District Centre as a ‘No-hawking zone’ and ‘No-vending zone. The said order also came to be affirmed in ***Federation of Nehru Place Association (Regd.) (Supra)*** where the Court concluded as under:-

“8. In view of the judgment passed in Bachchu Singh (supra), the impugned order dated 12.09.2016 is set aside. It is declared that the Nehru Place area is „no hawking” and „no vending” zone. The municipal authorities shall be bound by the stand taken by them in the case of Bachchu Singh (supra) and the same would apply to the present case as well. Resultantly, the appeal is allowed.”

18. It is also relevant to note that in ***Bachchu Singh (Supra)*** itself, the Petitioners, namely, Bachchu Singh and Rama Kant were held to be not



entitled to any relief as their name was not mentioned either in the list prepared by the Thareja Committee or the Chopra Committee.

19. These two judgments were challenged before the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court tagged along ***SLP(C) No. 023381 - 023382/2018*** titled '***Manushi Sangathan v. South Delhi Municipal Corporation***' with ***SLP(C) No. 19192/2018*** titled ***Arvind Gupta v. Govt. of NCT of Delhi*** wherein had initially granted status *quo* on 20th July 2018.

20. Following the said order in ***Arvind Gupta (Supra)***, the Supreme Court granted status *quo* initially in ***SLP(C) No. 023381 - 023382/2018*** titled '***Manushi Sangathan v. South Delhi Municipal Corporation***', however, after the dismissal of the ***Arvind Gupta (Supra)*** on 5th February 2020, the challenge in ***SLP(C) No. 023381 - 023382/2018*** also came to be dismissed.

21. Interestingly, in the SLP filed by Manushi Sangathan *i.e.*, ***SLP(C) No. 023381 - 023382/2018***, the issue relating to the 67 vendors was also raised as a question of law. The same is extracted hereinbelow:

"2. QUESTION OF LAW:

A. Whether is was permissible for the Delhi High Court to pass the Impugned Judgment and Orders to decare Nehru Place District Centre (NPDC) as a no-hawking/no-vending area and to remove all street vendors/hawkers and subsequently maintain it as free from vendors/hawkers, in violation of the prevailing law The Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 which has overriding effect as per S 33 and grants protection to all street vendors until they are surveyed and given certificate of vending (S3,4)?

B. Whether the Ld. Court below could have based its Judgments and Orders on the so-called 'consistent stand' taken by the authorities that the said market



Nehru Place District Centre (NPDC) is a 'no hawking' and 'no vending' zone by overlooking the law of the land?

C. Whether the Ld. Court below could have concluded that the DDA could decide to declare Nehru Place District Centre (NPDC) as a no hawking area by merely conducting a meeting to take such decision, against the mandate of High Court Judgment dated 17.04.2009 in 766/2008, and Supreme Court order dtd. 25.04.2011 in SLP (C) 29277/2009, which required the DDA to first make a reference to the Ward Vending Committee per Supreme Court directions in Sudhir Madan (per the than prevailing scheme for vending)?

D. Whether the Court below could have overlooked that even while it was then left open to DDA to examine whether the area should be declared non-hawking, such decision could not have been allowed without the DDA following the laid down procedure?

E. Whether the Delhi High Court ought to have allowed the DDA to go behind the back of the Supreme Court order dated 25.04.2011 in SLP (C) 29277/2007 and the law in force to rely upon its decision dated 10.08.2009 and the law in force to rely upon its decision dated 10.08.2009 taken prior to Order dtd. 25.04.2011, to declare Nehru Place as no-hawking? WHETHER the Ld. Court below could have overlooked that the said decision was already on the record in SLP(C) 29277/2009 and had been followed by the DDA's undertakings in its affidavits dated 20.10.2010 and 07.12.2010 filed in continuance to the above forming part of Order dtd 25.04.2011, wherein it was required to first make a reference to the Ward Vending Committee?

F. Whether the Ld. Court below, could have allowed the authorities' erroneous and false position with respect to the Nehru Place District (NPDC) to conclude and



declare it as a 'no hawking' and 'no vending' zone against the prevailing statute specially, first Schedule Clause 3 (e) of The S.V. Act, that expressly prohibits declaration of any area as a no-vending zone until a survey is conducted and plan for street vending is formulated?

G. Whether the Ld. Court below could have arbitrarily shrunk the extremely wide definition of street vendors today by relying upon 20 year old schemes to wrongly conclude that vendors who were not mentioned in the lists prepared by Thareja Committee 1992 or Chopra Committee were not "regular" vendors, by overlooking the subsequent developments in the law since 2009, including the Supreme Court's nationwide directions on 09.09.2013 in para 21.1-21.17 of Maharashtra Ekta Hawkers Union & Anr. Vs Municipal Corporation, Greater Mumbai & Ors., (2014) 1 SCC 490, Para 20 sub para 4.5.4, directing implementation of The National Policy of Urban Street Vendors 2009 in all municipal areas of the country, and for all street vendors to be registered in accordance with para 4.5.4 of the said Policy, and all existing street vendors operating across the country to be allowed to operate till the exercise of regulation and creation of vending/hawking zones was completed in terms of the 2009 Policy?

H. Whether the Ld. Court below, could have arbitrarily shrunk the definition of 'street vendors' to so-called 'regular vendors' in contravention of the Street Vendors Act, by limiting the wide definition of street vendors under S 2(1)(l) of the Act to those listed by Chopra and Thareja committees under old schemes that are non-existent today, despite the prevailing law, The Street Vendors Act 2014, expressly covering every 'street vendor' under its ambit of protection u/S 3(3) of the Street Vendors Act, 2014?



I. Whether the Ld. Court below could have overlooked the express statutory protection under S 3(3) of The Street Vendors Act, 2014 which mandates that no street vendors shall be evicted or relocated till the Survey of all street vendors, as defined u/S 2(1)(l), has been completed and the Certificate of Vending issued to all street vendors and S 33, which gives the Act overriding effect?

J. Whether the Ld. Court below could have overlooked the settled principles of law laid down by this Court in Sudhir Madan (2009) 17 SCC 579, [dtd 17.5.2007 – Para 30], Gainda Ram case (2010) 10 SCC 715 [dtd 08.10.2010 – Paras 48, 67], and Maharashtra Ekta Hawkers Union & Anr. V. Municipal Corporation, Greater Mumbai & Ors. (2014) 1 SCC 490 – paras 21,21.12] that any administrative action is always subject to law that may be framed by the competent legislature; that nothing short of a law can regulate hawking under Article 19(1)(g) and MCD/NDMC scheme and even Supreme Court orders that try to regular hawking are not law?

K. Whether the Ld. Court below could have overlooked the subsequent mandate in Maharashtra Ekta Hawkers Union case [(2014) 1 SCC 490] that all existing street vendors operating across the country were protected to operate till the completion and registration and creation of vending/hawking zones in terms of the 2009 Policy, until the coming into force of the new law, which law came into force in 2014 and grants protection to every street vendor during implementation of the Act?

L. Whether the Impugned Judgment in LPA 623/2016 can be sustained as it was in violation of the principles of natural justice as well, as vendors were not given a chance to be heard although they would be affected by the Impugned Judgments and Orders of the court?



M. Whether the Impugned Judgments can be sustained given its gross violation of Articles 141 & 144 of the Constitution of India by going contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court and falling to act in aid of the orders of the Supreme Court of India? ”

22. A perusal of the above grounds and questions of law would show that Manushi Sanghatan had argued in the said SLP that the 68 vendors cannot be disturbed. With the dismissal of the SLP on 6th January, 2022, the rights, if any, that these vendors had prior to the said judgement in effect also came to an end. The relevant portion of the order dated 6th January, 2022 reads as under:

“We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. At the outset, it is required to be noted that, the present Special Leave Petitions was tagged with SLP (C) No. 19192/2018. On the basis of the order passed in SLP (C) No. 19192/2018, in the present matter, this Court directed to issue notice and directed to maintain status quo by the parties.

It is reported and it is not in dispute that the said Special Leave Petition (C) No. 19192/2018 has been dismissed by the coordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 05.02.2020.

In that view of the matter, the present Special Leave Petitions also stand dismissed. Ad-interim relief granted earlier stands vacated.

Pending application stands disposed of. ”

23. The decisions in ***Bachchu Singh (Supra)*** and ***Federation of Nehru Place Association (Regd) (Supra)*** were thus not interfered with by the Supreme Court in terms of order dated 6th January, 2022. Accordingly, the declaration of Nehru Place District Centre as a ‘No-hawking zone’ and ‘No-vending zone’ having been categorically affirmed in two decisions is also



binding for this Court as well.

24. Thereafter, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 13th August, 2021 took *suo moto* cognizance of a fire incident reported in building Nehru Place District Commercial Centre i.e., **W.P. (C) 8430/2021** and had passed various directions as under:-

“1. Yesterday, an incident of fire has been reported in a building at Nehru Place, District Commercial Centre. The said District Commercial Centre has several high-rise buildings, and in between these buildings, there is pavement area for circulation of people. On the said pavement area, over the years, hawkers and vendors have come to claim the space, meant for pedestrians. The enormity of the problem caused by the hawkers and vendors at the Nehru Place area can be seen from a video circulated on social media which shows that it was difficult for the fire tenders to access the building where the fire broke out. It also shows the complete lack of any cleanliness or maintenance on the part of the Municipal Authorities. We are also informed that the Nehru Place area has been declared as a no-hawking no-vending zone.

2. On our query, we are informed by the SHO Virendra Singh, PS Kalkaji under whose jurisdiction the Nehru Place, District Commercial Centre falls that there are several orders of stay granted by the Courts in favour of the hawkers and vendors – which is the reason that even though the area has been declared as no hawking and vending zone, the said vendors have not been removed. He also states that the removal drive of the hawkers and vendors is conducted from time to time but other hawkers and vendors come back once the drive is over.

3. We find it difficult to understand how any person, who is not protected by Court orders, can continue to occupy any space, and hawk or vend without the



connivance and blessings of the concerned local authorities.

4. We direct the Delhi Police as well as the SDMC to ensure, on a daily basis, that there is no hawking and vending resorted to at the Nehru Place, District Commercial Centre by any person who does not have an operative order of protection granted by any Court. The SHO, PS Kalkaji and the Executive Engineer concerned of the SDMC under whose jurisdiction the said area falls, shall be personally responsible to ensure compliance of this direction, and failure to do so on their part shall invite strict action against them by the Court.

5. The SHO has informed us that the re-development work has been going on in the Nehru Place, District Commercial Centre for a long time, and the agency is not completing the work.

6. We direct the SDMC, Delhi Police, and the DDA to hold a joint meeting, and to place before the Court, status report(s) with regard to the implementation of the no-hawking no-vending policy qua Nehru Place, District Commercial Centre. The status report should disclose the particulars of all such agencies employed, and should also disclose as to which of the authorities, namely DDA or SDMC is getting the work done.

7. The status report(s) should also disclose all the orders of stay, as operative, which are claimed to be the reason why all encroachers, hawkers and vendors are not being removed from the said area despite it being declared as no-hawking no-vending zone.

8. Since it is stated by Mr. Pande, who appears for the SDMC that the Public Works Department of the GNCTD may also be getting some works done in the area, we direct issuance of notice to the PWD, GNCTD as well. They should also disclose as to why there is delay in the process of carrying out works in



the Nehru Place area by filing a status report before the next date of hearing.

9. Since we have taken cognizance of this matter as a PIL, the orders with regard to its listing may be obtained from Hon'ble the Chief Justice by the office and, accordingly, the matter may be listed on the next date before the appropriate Bench.

10. List on 24.08.2021.

11. Looking to the urgency of the matter, it is made clear that no further time shall be granted for filing of the status reports to any department. In case, the status reports are not filed, the Commissioner, Delhi Police; Commissioner, SDMC; and Vice Chairman, DDA, as the case may be shall remain present on the next date of hearing.

12. The detailed status reports be filed before the next date of hearing."

25. Thereafter, a proper fire drill was also directed to be conducted as per order dated 24th August, 2021 which reads as under:-

"The Chief Fire Officer, Delhi is directed to ensure that the local fire station conducts a mock fire drill in Nehru Place on a working day and identifies the shortcomings/hindrances.

The recommendations/suggestions mooted by the Fire Department shall be furnished to this Court as well as to the Committee headed by the Chief Engineer, DDA within three weeks. The report of the concerned Fire Officer as well as the action taken report by the Chief Engineer, DDA shall be filed with the Registry of this Court at least a week prior to the next date of hearing. List on 07th The order be uploaded on the website forthwith. Copy of the order be also forwarded to the learned counsel through e-mail. October, 2021."

26. Accordingly, the fire drill was conducted and the 1d Division Bench had



noticed that the recommendation of the Delhi Fire Service was for removing all hawkers from the Nehru Place District Centre. The said order dated 7th October, 2021 reads as under:-

“In pursuance to the last order, the Delhi Fire Services has conducted a mock fire drill at Nehru Place. During the said drill, the following serious shortcomings/hindrances were observed:

1. None of the vehicle (Fire Engine, Ambulance) could reach to the incident place, fire tenders could only reach up to upper plaza, the lower plaza was not reachable. The time taken by the first fire unit was 11 minutes.

2. As the lower plaza was not approachable to fire units, pitching of rescue vehicles like hydraulic platforms will not be possible.

3. The time taken by the various agencies was too high, which indicates that there are significant hindrances due to heavy pedestrian movement, heavy traffic, hawkers and parking problems. The Delhi fire service has made the following recommendations:

1. All the entries to the upper Plaza as well as lower plaza should be made clear by removing the Boom barriers, barricades etc. All the levels must be approachable to Fire engines by minimum 06m wide motorable road/ramps.

*2. **The place may be made hawker free zone.***

3. Clear cut 06m wide road shall be ensured, the side parking should not be allowed.

DDA, Delhi Police and SDMC are directed to ensure that the recommendations/suggestions given to this Court by the Delhi Fire Brigade are implemented at the earliest.

Respondents are also directed to earmark a lane for emergency services so that the fire brigade and ambulance can reach Nehru Place at the earliest without any hindrance/obstruction. DCP (Traffic)



will ensure that the said lane is not encroached upon and is always free for movement for fire brigade and ambulance.

Learned counsel for respondent No. 2/SDMC states that despite the specific area being delineated for hawking, the hawkers are not restricting themselves to the said area. He further states that only 95 vendors have interim orders in their favour from the Apex Court as well as from this Court. He also states that the hawkers/vendors are not complying with the terms of Tehbazari/conditions of vending.

Learned counsel for respondent No. 2/SDMC states that out of 95 street vendors who have injunction/interim orders in their favour, 33 have filed petitions in this Court while 62 street vendors who are part of Manushi Sangathan have filed petitions before the Supreme Court. He states that SDMC shall be filing an application for early hearing in the Special Leave Petition in which protection has been granted to 62 vendors, namely, Manushi Sangathan Vs. SDMC, SLP (C) No. 28875/2018. The said statement is taken on record.

Registry is directed to list the petitions filed by 33 vendors along with contempt petition being CCP 703/2021, subject to orders of Hon'ble the Chief Justice on 18th October, 2021. The particulars of the petitions filed by 33 vendors in this Court are as under:

- 1. W.P.(C) 6823/2017 (lead matter), Premvati & Ors. Versus SDMC & Ors.*
- 2. W. P. (C) 7307/2017*
- 3. W. P. (C) 7405/2017*
- 4. W. P. (C) 9611/2017*
- 5. CCP No. 681/2017 in WP(C) No. 6879/2017*
- 6. CCP No. 703/2021 in WP(C) 6823/2017*

This Court directs SDMC, DDA and Delhi Police to ensure that no other individual or entity other than 95 vendors, hawk in and around Nehru Place.



Even the identities of the 95 vendors shall be verified and the respondents shall ensure that the vendors comply with the terms and conditions of Tehbazari/vending.

This Court also directs Mr. Arjun Pant, Mr. Sanjay Lao, Mr. Divya Prakash Pande, Advocates along with members of the committee in particular, Chief Engineer Project, Additional CP (Traffic), Additional CP, South-East and Deputy Commissioner, Central Zone to visit Nehru Place within the next fortnight at a mutually convenient date and time and file a status report. The said report shall be filed at least a week prior to the next date of hearing. Ms. Sakshi Popli, Advocate appearing on behalf of Delhi Jal Board is also directed to file a status report within two weeks.

List on 10th November, 2021."

27. As can be seen from the above order dated 7th October 2021, the clear stand of the Delhi Fire Service was that Nehru Place District Centre has to be made a hawker free zone.

28. Today, the Court has heard detailed submissions on behalf of the hawkers made by Mr. Amit Singh Chaddha, Id. Sr. Counsel, Ms. Indira Unninayar, Id. Counsel and Ms. Anamika Ghai, Id. Counsel. On behalf of the Nehru Place Trade Association, Mr. Pranav Proothi, Id. Counsel has made his submissions.

29. On behalf of the DDA and MCD, Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Id. Sr. Counsel, Ms. Puja Kalra, Id. Standing Counsel, Ms. Sangeeta Chandra, Id. Counsel and Mr. Arjun, Id. Counsel have all made their submissions. Counsels have also handed over certain photographs taken as recently as Saturday *i.e.*, 26th September, 2026 from the Nehru Place market. Some of the images handed over by the Counsels for the parties are extracted below:-



2026:DHC:8706-DB





2026:DHC:8706-DB



30. A perusal of the photographs handed over both by the Petitioners as also by the Respondents leaves no manner of doubt in the mind of the Court that the declaration of Nehru Place District Centre as a ‘No-hawking zone’ and ‘No-vending zone’ deserves to be confirmed. However, a *Id.* Single Judge of this Court in order dated 13th October, 2014 passed in a batch of matters wherein the lead matter is ***W.P. (C) 6893/2008 titled ‘Prem Shankar Gupta & Ors. v. DDA & Anr.’*** observed as under:

“Present writ petitions have been filed seeking directions to respondents not to displace/dislocate the petitioners from their respective squatting sites at Nehru Place, New Delhi till allotment of tehbazari sites and to implement the Act No. 43 of 2007.

Mr. Amit Chadha, learned senior counsel appearing for petitioners states that petitioners are the



tehbazari holders who are functional as of today. He, however, states that petitioners have not been officially allotted tehbazari sites.

Learned counsel for respondent-DDA state that Nehru Place has been notified as No Hawking Zone and after development the area has been handed over to respondent-Corporation.

This Court is of the view that the present writ petitions have been overtaken by subsequent events inasmuch as the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as Act, 2014) has come into force on 4th March, 2014. The Act, 2014 provides for constitution of a Committee which is to conduct survey of existing street vendors and frame a scheme for relocation.

In the opinion of this Court, Section 3(3) of the Act, 2014 clearly states that no street vendor shall be evicted or relocated till the survey to be carried out by the Committee has been completed and certificate of vending has been issued to all street vendors.

Consequently, State Government is directed to make the Town Vending Committee functional within a period of eight weeks. Petitioners are also permitted to simultaneously file their representations with the Committee within a period of eight weeks.

Upon the said representations being filed, the Committee is directed to decide the same expeditiously, preferably within six months.

With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petitions and applications are disposed of.

Order dasti."

31. Subsequently, the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 was passed and as per the same the



vendors cannot be evicted until a decision is taken by the Town Vending Committee (hereinafter, 'TVC').

32. The Court has been appraised by the Id. Counsel for the MCD that the TVC-II is on the verge of being constituted as the elections to the TVC-II have already concluded. Under Section 3 of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014, recognized vendors cannot be evicted or relocated till the survey is completed or certificates of vending are issued to the vendors.

33. The submission on behalf of the Traders Association is that Section 3(3) of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 protection would not be available for persons vending in 'No-hawking zone' and 'No-vending zone'.

34. In the meantime, three other writ petitions have been filed which are being dealt by this Court in the present order being:

- ***W.P. (C) 6823/2017*** filed by 23 vendors;
- ***W.P. (C) 7307/2017*** filed by 2 vendors; and
- ***W.P. (C) 7405/2017*** filed by 4 vendors.

35. The names of these 29 vendors also appear in the list submitted by Mr. Solanki in the affidavit filed before the Supreme Court. Accordingly, the same have been granted protection by this Court till date.

36. In the meantime, these hawkers were placed in sites which the MCD had identified. However, the photographs extracted above would show that even this particular site is totally congested in view of the presence of the hawkers and fire tenders would not be easily able to move in this area.

37. Id. Counsel for the parties have informed the Court that there are more than 400 vendors who are presently vending in the Nehru Place District



Centre, most of whom are clearly unauthorized. The only authorized vendors in the Nehru Place District Centre are:

- a) 62 vendors who are part of ***W.P. (C) 2183/2026*** filed by Manushri Sangathan. There are 5 more vendors who have filed the said writ petition, however, they are vending outside the District Centre area.
- b) 23 vendors who are part of ***W.P. (C) 6823/2017***, out of whom, one Petitioner is stated to be no longer vending. Ld. Counsel for the Petitioners submit that at present only 22 Petitioners are hawking in the Nehru Place Area and hence, only those 22 Petitioners, which includes the Petitioner in ***W.P.(C) 9611/2017***, be permitted to vend.
- c) 6 vendors who are part of the ***W.P. (C) 7307/2017*** and ***W.P. (C) 7405/2017***.

38. The list of the said 90 vendors is set out in **Annexure A** to this order.

39. Apart from the above, none of the other vendors have any valid vending right in the Nehru Place District Centre. Especially after the repeated orders being passed by multiple benches of this Court declaring Nehru Place as a ‘No-hawking zone’ and ‘No-vending zone’. In fact, even these vendors, who have challenged the matter before the Supreme Court, had lost in terms of order dated 6th January, 2022 passed in ***SLP(C) No. 023381 - 023382/2018*** titled ‘***Manushi Sangathan v. South Delhi Municipal Corporation***’.

40. However, recently, the Supreme Court in the decision dated 9th April, 2026 in ***SLP (Civil) No. 21349/2025*** titled ‘***Malkit Singh and Anr. v. State of U.T. Chandigarh and Ors.***’ observed as under:

“[...]

11. While the efforts carried out thus far have apparently borne results and are therefore appreciable, it is a matter of concern for us whether all relevant efforts have been made to regularize such hitherto



illegal vendors, including those who are not before us, by granting them space in designated vending zones so as to ensure minimum disruption to their livelihood in the long term. Any action by the State that disrupts this livelihood must therefore be carried out with care, fairness, and a clear sense of responsibility.

If vending zones have already been identified and designated, it is not enough for the authorities to simply point to their existence. Removing vendors from familiar locations, even for legitimate public reasons such as easing congestion or improving urban order, creates an immediate need for support. Vending zones are meant to provide a lawful and workable alternative, and that purpose is lost if displaced vendors are left uncertain, uninformed, or unable to access these spaces in practice. Let the State clearly clarify the existing information available at the defined vending zones which in any event have to be acceptable to all concerned.

12. This kind of assistance is not an act of generosity. It reflects a basic respect for the right to earn a living and to carry on a lawful occupation. When vendors are removed without any real help in relocating, the hardship caused is out of proportion to the regulatory goal, and such an exercise risks becoming punitive rather than orderly. In essence, if vendors are displaced through encroachment drives and lawful vending zones are available, the State has a duty to actively support their transition to these zones in accordance with the law. Doing so upholds both the spirit of regulation and the human reality of those whose lives depend on street vending.

13. It is also to be recognized that forcible shifting or removal of encroachments, while it may be entirely in accordance with law, disrupts the customer base that



comes with the shop being located at a particular area. The State is required to undertake efforts to let residents know that the shops have been shifted, i.e., have awareness drives that would divert the customers to the designated area. Let an affidavit be filed with the relevant details, within two weeks of this order.”

41. In terms of the aforesaid decision, if the street vendors are vending in a ‘No-vending zone’, the MCD or the concerned authority has a duty to assist them in moving from a ‘No-vending zone’ to a vending zone, so as to provide the street vendors with a workable alternative from where they can earn their livelihood.

42. Under these circumstances, bearing in mind that the TVC-II is about to be constituted and these vendors have been vending in this area for several years, the above mentioned vendors shall be permitted to vend at Site X marked in the map below:-





43. The 90 vendors mentioned in Annexure 'A' shall move to site 'X' by 12th October, 2026. It is made clear that TVC-II after being constituted shall take a decision as to whether these vendors are entitled to Certificate of Vending or not and if so, the area where they would be vending. The said decision shall be taken within two months after the constitution of the TVC-II.

44. **Insofar as the Nehru Place District Centre area, except the identified portion above as marked X, the entire Nehru Place District Centre is declared as a 'No-hawking zone' and 'No-vending zone'.**

45. After 12th October, 2026, the MCD is free to take action and remove all unauthorized vendors. After the unauthorized vendors are removed, the Delhi Fire Services shall conduct an inspection of the Nehru Place District Centre and file compliance a report only in *W.P.(C) 8430/2021*.

46. The TVC-II shall communicate its decision to these vendors, who have been permitted to vend at Site No. X, in terms of Section 18 of the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014.

47. The Delhi Police shall render all co-operation with the MCD and the DDA to ensure compliance of today's order.

48. In case there are any other vendors whose names are recognised in the affidavit filed by the DDA before the Supreme Court under signature of Mr. Solanki, the concerned Assistant Commissioner, MCD shall also accommodate the said Petitioners, however, the same shall be subjected to the decision of TVC-II. The said vendors can make the representation to the concerned Assistant Commissioner, MCD who shall consider the same in accordance with law.



2026:DHC:8706-DB



49. In these matters, several applications have been filed on behalf of the vendors seeking impleadment. The details of the same are as under:

- ***CM. APPL. 11085/2022 in W.P. (C) 8430/2021***
- ***CM. APPL. 11125/2022 in W.P. (C) 8430/2021***
- ***CM. APPL. 11139/2022 in W.P. (C) 8430/2021***
- ***CM. APPL. 19730/2022 in W.P. (C) 8430/2021***

50. If any of these Applicants are recognised in the affidavit filed by the DDA before the Supreme Court under signature of Mr. Solanki, the said Applicants can also make a representation to the concerned Assistant Commissioner, MCD who shall consider the same in accordance with law.

51. All the writ petitions are disposed of with these terms. All pending applications are also disposed of.

52. A copy of this order be communicated to the Delhi Fire Services by the Registry.

53. List for compliance report by the Delhi Fire Service, in ***W.P.(C) 8430/2021*** on 30th November, 2026.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE

DINESH BHATT
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 28, 2026/MR/CK



2026:DHC:8706-DB

**Annexure - A****In W.P. (C) 2183/2026**

S. No.	Name	Father's Name/Husband's Name	Address
1.	Balram Halder @ Balram Haldar	R.K. Halder @ R.K. Haldar	H.No. D-2/49, Phese (Phase)-2, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
2.	Ram Lal	Babu Lal	A-1/1020, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar Phase-1, Aali, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
3.	Santosh @ Santosh Kumar	Jugal Kishore @ Jugal Kishor Shrivastav	E-21, B Gali No. 2, Jaitpur Extn. Part-1, Badarpur, South Delhi, Delhi – 110044
4.	Rajkumar @ Raj Kumar	Bateshwar Sharma	A-2/ 1202, JJ Colony Madanpur Khadar, South Delhi, Delhi-110076
5.	Imtiaz Ali @ Imtiyaz Ali	Mumtaz Ali	P-117/2 and P-117/3, 2 nd Floor, Batla House, Jamia Nagar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110025
6.	Maya Dinn @ Mayadeen	Shri Pate @ Patte	House No. 493, Block B-1, JJ Cluster, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
7.	Tarun @ Tarun Kumar	Badami Lal	B-1/867, JJ Colony Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
8.	Sanjay Puri	K.L. Puri @ Kherati Lal Puri	E10, B K Dutt Colony, Karbala, Lodi Road H.O., South Delhi, Delhi 110003



2026:DHC:8706-DB



9.	Sharfudinn @ Mohd Sarfuddin	Hafizudinn @ Hafij	H.NO. B/1/416, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
10.	Dilip Kumar @ Dilip Kumar Singh	Dineshwar Prasad	RZ-9/40, Upper Ground Floor, Gali No. 12, Tugalkabad Extn. Aali South Delhi, Delhi - 110019
11.	Ashwani Kumar	Jaipal Monga	647-9, Lal Dora, Devli Village, South Delhi, Delhi – 110062
12.	Deepak Sen	Moolchand @ Moolchand Sen	B-34, Harkesh Nagar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110020
13.	Sudhir Singh @ Suddhir Kumar Singh (Late) Survived by Son Rohan Kumar	Dineshwar Prasad Singh	RZ-51, Gali No. 6, Tuglakabad Extn., Delhi South Delhi – 110019
14.	Moolchand spouse of Late Narmada Devi (Mool Chand expired and is survived by his son Shanker)	Moolchand	A2-1812, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi - 110076
15.	Sita Ram @ Sitaram Jadon	Niranjan Singh	H.No. 54 B, Gali No. 2, Block A, Saurabh Vihar, Jaitpur, P.O Badarpur, Dist, South Delhi, Delhi, 110044



2026:DHC:8706-DB



16.	Shamsudinn @ Mohd Shamsuddin	Hafizadinn Abdul Hafizuddin	M-7, 4 th Floor, Street No. 6, Joga Bai, Extn. Jamia Nagar, Okhla, New Friends Colony, South Delhi, Delhi – 110025
17.	Ranjit Kr. Gupta	Daya Shankar Gupta	B-70, 3 rd Floor, Ganesh Nagar, Pandav Nagar Complex, Shakarpur, East Delhi, Delhi – 110092
18.	Divya	Pradeep Kumar @ Madhav Das	1458 D, Gali No. 13, Govindpuri, Kalkaji, South Delhi, Delhi - 110019
19.	Sanjay Kumar Nigam	Om Prakash Nigam	E-6A/219, Sangam Vihar Devli, South Delhi, Devli, Delhi – 110080
20.	Jitender Pal Gulati @ Jatinder Pal Gulati	Late Darbari Lal, S/o Late Girdhari Lal	J-1/242, 1 st Floor, DDA Flats, Kalkaji, South Delhi, Delhi – 110019
21.	Pooja Narula D/o Asha Rani and Late Ram Gopal Sahini @Ram Gopal Shani (W/o Mukesh Narula)	Late Ram Gopal Sahini @Ram Gopal Shani	A-235/1, Phase – 1, Ashok Vihar, North West Delhi, Delhi - 110052
22.	Balbir Ranjan son of Late Yogindera Singh @Yoginder Singh @ Joginder Singh	Late Yogindera Singh @Yoginder Singh @ Joginder Singh	B-163, Gali No. 6, Pandav Nagar, Shakarpur, Gandhi Nagar, East Delhi, Delhi – 110092

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By:DHIRENDER KUMAR
Signing Date:05.10.2026
16:58:56

CONT.CAS(C) 703/2021 & other connected matters

Page 37 of 45



2026:DHC:8706-DB



23.	Ashok Kumar @ Ashok Jha	Upender Kumar @ Upendra Jha	E-93, Ganesh Nagar, Pandav Nagar Complex, Shakarpur, East Delhi, Delhi – 110092
24.	Ram Gopal @ Ram Gopal Gupta	Shri Ram Bahadur @ Ram Bahadur Gupta	G-80, Jaitpur Extn. Part-1, Badarpur, Jaitpur, South Delhi, Delhi – 110044
25.	Rahul Verma (grandson of Late Rukmani Verma & Suraj Pal Verma)	Late Satya Prakash Verma @ Satya Prakash (son of Late Rukmani Verma & Suraj Pal)	G-21, T.Camp, Block G, Khichdi Pur, Chilla Saroda, Khadar, East Delhi, Delhi - 110091
26.	Shanti @ Shanti Devi	Suresh Chand D/o Kunwarpal	A1-32, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, Aali, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
27.	Umesh Prasad	Bhola Singh	Saurav Vihar, Hari Nagar Part-2, Gali No. 19, House No. 604, Block N. RMP School, Badarpur Jait Pur, South Delhi, Delhi – 110044
28.	Sonu Gupta	Late Om Prakash Gupta	B-1-381, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
29.	Ram Prasad, survived by Kamla Devi, W/o Ram Prasad	S/o Lala Ram	House no C-19, Extanion (Extension), Tigri, Dist: South Delhi, Delhi – 110062
30.	Sidh Nath Singh	Bansi Lal @ Bansi Lal Singh	H.NO. 94, Gali No. 7, Block-C-1-A, Nangli Vihar, Ext. Bapraula West Delhi, Delhi – 110043



2026:DHC:8706-DB



31.	Ram Avtar @ Ramavtar (Late) Survived by Rahul Kumar	Puran Lal	1406-F, Gali No. 13, Govindpuri, Kalkaji, South Delhi, Delhi - 110019
32.	Ravi Puri @ Ravi Kumar Puri	Kherati Lal Puri	E10, B K Dutt Colony, Karbala, Lodi Road H.O., South Delhi, Delhi 110003
33.	Mahavir Jain	P.C. Jain @ Padam Chand Jain	B-577, Gali No. 2, Ganesh Nagar, Shakarpur, Baramad, East Delhi, Delhi – 110092
34.	Ramesh Kumar	Hansraj @ Hans Raj	H.NO. 72, Gali No. 16, Block – H, Sangam Vihar, Pushpa Bhawan, South Delhi, Delhi – 110062
35.	S.K. Gulati @ Suresh Kumar Gulati	Indir / Indar Raj Gulati	C-103, 2 nd Floor, Dayanand Colony, Lajpat Nagar-4, South Delhi, Delhi – 110024
36.	Narender Lal @ Narendra Yadav	Munner Yadav @ Munnar Yadav	H.No. 1436, I-Block, Gali No. 16, Sangam Vihar, Hamdard Nagar, Pushpa Bhawan, South Delh, Delhi – 110062
37.	Rakesh Gupta	Late Shri Om Prakash Gupta	A-112, Third Floor, Back Portion, Near HDFC Bank, Kalkaji, NCT of Delhi, 110019
38.	Yash Pal @ Yashpal	Late Shri Bihari Lal	34/1119, 2 nd Floor, DDA Flats, Madangir, Dr. Ambedkar Nagar, Pushpa Bhawan, South Delhi, Delhi – 110062



2026:DHC:8706-DB



39.	Mahender Prasad Sahu @ Mahender Pd. Sahoo	Athari Sahu @ Itwari Sahoo	B-1/247, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, Kalkaji, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
40.	Raj Ballab @ Raj Balak S/o Ram Preet, (Late) survived by Deepak (nephew)	Deena Nath	C-1122, JJ Colony, Madan Pur Khadar, New Delhi, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi - 110076
41.	Khem Bahadur	Moti Ram	B-1/798, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi - 110076
42.	Hira Lal	Late Lala Ram	H. No. C-1253, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
43.	Kamal Kishore	Ram Raj Morya	C-1st/988, Madangir, Dr. Ambedkar Nagar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110062
44.	Mohhamed Aarif @ Arif Hasan	Abul Hasan	H.O. A-53, A-Block, Shahin Bagh, Road, No.- 6, Near Thokar No. 6, Abulfazal Part -2, Jamia Nagar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110025
45.	Rakesh Kumar Gupta	Ram Lartya	R-57, Chanakya Place – 2, D.K. Mohan Garden, West Delhi, Delhi – 110059
46.	Chandan Manchanda	Late Kishan Manchanda @Kishan Lal	36/1208 DDA Flats, Madangir, Dr. Ambedkar Nagar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110062



2026:DHC:8706-DB



47.	Chandra Pal @ Chandrapal	Late Hari @ Hari Singh	Jav, Jao, Mathura, U.P. - 281403 (Permanent add.)
48.	Ram Kumar @ Ram Kumar Gupta	Late Hundi Lal Gupta	E-35, Ground Floor, Prakash Dhaba wali Gali, Ganesh Nagar, Pandav Nagar Complex, Madangir, Fazalpur, East Delhi, Delhi – 110092
49.	Shanti @ Shanti Devi	Tara Chand	H.NO. B/1/480, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
50.	Bhawari Devi @ Bhoore Devi	Ramu	A-134, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
51.	Bhura @ Bhure Lal	Gariba @ Gariba Das @ Grebu	H. No. A-2/454 Near Jalebi Chowk, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi – 110076
52.	Satish @ Satish Chandra	Siya Ram	H. No. 253, Gali No. 2, Shakti Vihar, Mithapur Extn. Jaitpur South Delhi, Delhi – 110044
53.	Shambhu @ Shambhu Nath Gupta	Shiv Nath Gupta	F-221, Harsh Vihar, Hari Nagar Part-3, Jaitpur Extn. Badarpur, South Delhi, Delhi - 110044
54.	Vimal Kumar Jha @ Vimal Kumar	Upender Jha @ Upendra Jha	E-93, Ganesh Nagar, Pandav Nagar Complex, Shakarpur Baramad, East Delhi, Delhi – 110092
55.	Latto @ Lato Saw @ Lato Sahoo	Atwari Sahoo @ Atavari Saw	Village Tetariya Salaidih Birani, P.O Gando Thana, Birani, Gando, Giridih, Jharkhand – 825324 (Permanent add)



2026:DHC:8706-DB



56.	Suraj Mukhiya	Phaguni Mukhiya @ Late Atwari Shiv	88, Hemkunt Colony, Nehru Place, Greater Kailash, South Delhi, Delhi - 110048
57.	Narayan Das	Choke Lal	H.N-H-17/220, Gali No. 17, Sangam Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi - 110062
58.	Mahesh Tomar son of Late Kishan Tomar	Late Kishan Tomar	A-2/1055, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi - 110076
59.	Shyam Sunder @ Shyam Sunder	Ram Avtar	A1/59 Face 1 (Phase 1), JJ Caloney (Colony), Madanpur Khader, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi - 110076
60.	Syed Abdul Karim @ Abdul Karim Khan	Hadish Khan	K-70, Kalkaji, Aali, South Delhi, Delhi - 110019
61.	Jamaludinn	Rahim Baksh	H.No. 16/883, Gali No. 16, Rajasthani Gali, Sangam Vihar, Pushpa Bhawan, South Delhi, Delhi - 110062
62.	Kalu	Late Mangi Devi & Late Dal Chand	B1/1020, JJ Colony, Madanpur Khadar, Sarita Vihar, South Delhi, Delhi - 110076

In W.P. (C) 6823/2017

<i>S No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Father's Name / Husband's Name</i>	<i>Address</i>
1.	Chandrawati	W/O Shiv Kumar	1194, Gali No.13, Govindpuri, Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019
2.	Rajesh Kumar	Late Prem Shankar Gupta	8/48, Dakshin Puri, New Delh110062



2026:DHC:8706-DB



3.	Shri Dinesh Kumar	Late Chander Pal	A/262, First Floor, Dda Flats Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019
4.	Shri Veer Pal	Shri Ramswarup	Lal Maharaj Dharamshala, Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019
5.	Smt. Savita	W/O Late Mukesh Kumar	A/261, Dda Flats, Govindpuri, Kalkaji, New Delhi-110019
6.	Shri Ramesh Kumar	Shri Ram Lal	B-1/171, JJ Colony, Madanpurkhaddar, Badarpur, Newdelhi
7.	Sh. Mukesh Babu	Late Prem Shankar Gupta	8/43, Dakshinpuri, Ambedkar Nagar New Delhi
8.	Survesh Kumar	Late Prem Shankar Gupta	48, Block-8, Dakshinpuri. Ambedkar Nagar, New Delhi
9.	Shri Rajesh	Late Raghubar Dayal	11/51, Dakshinpuri, New Delhi-110062
10.	Shri Amlesh Tiwari	Kapil Dev Tiwari	A-100, Madanpur Khadar New Delhi
11.	Shri Jogender Kumar	Shri Ram Lal	B-19, Krishna Park, Khanpur Road, New Delhi
12.	Shri Jagdish	Late Raghubar Dayal	A-2/1266, Madanpur Khadar New Delhi
13.	Shri Sushil Mathur	Late Raghbuar Dayal	11751, Dakshin Puri New Delhi
14.	Shri Virender Singh	Shri Kedar Singh	F-154, Harsh Vihar, Hari Nagar, Phase-II, Jaitpur New Delhi
15.	Shri Pardeep Kumar	Shri Bhagwan Dass	208, A Iind Floor, Parkash Mohalla Garhi, East Of KailashNew Delhi



2026:DHC:8706-DB



16.	Smt. Leelawati Singh	W/O Late Sanjay Kumar Singh	H. No. 154, Block-F, Harsh Vihar, Prince Colony Jaitpur, P.O. Hari Nagar, Badarpur New Delhi-110044
17.	Mrs. Seema Gupta	W/O Late Rinku Gupta	House No.B-43, Street No. 4, South Ganesh Nagar, Near Badi Mother Diary, Delhi East, Delhi- 110092
18.	Mahender Singh	Late Radhey Shyam	C-14, L.I.G, Panchsheel Vihar Khirki, New Delhi
19.	Raj Kumar	Shri. Bhagwan Dass	208, Iii Floor, Prakash Mohalla, Garhi, East Of Kailash, New Delhi
20.	Master Shrivayaay	Late Raju	G-1020, Jj Colony, Tigri, New Delhi
21.	Meena Khatoon	W/O Late Shri. Rashid Ahmad	A-2/975, Jj Colony, Madanpur Khadar New Delhi
22.	Kritika Chauhan & Master Gagan Chauhan	D/S/o Late Yashwant Chauhan and Late Neelam Chauhan Granddaughter/G randson of Late Sundri Chauhan (Petitioner in W.P.(C) 9611/2017)	A-185, Devli Extension, Deoli, South Delhi, Delhi-110062

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By:DHIRENDER KUMAR
Signing Date:05.10.2026
16:58:56

CONT.CAS(C) 703/2021 & other connected matters

Page 44 of 45



2026:DHC:8706-DB



In W.P. (C) 7307/2017 and W.P. (C) 7405/2017

<i>S. No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Father's name/ Husband's name</i>	<i>Address</i>
1.	Mr. Vipin Narang	L.S Narang	16/8 IIIrd floor, Kalkaji, Delhi-110019
2.	Mr. Preetam Kumar Gupta	Kapil Dev Gupta	B-356, Ganesh Nagar, Complex, Pandav Nagar, Delhi-110092
3.	Mr V. Saule Raj	Late Sh. B Venkatachalam	7-C, J Pocket, 1st Floor Sheikh Sarai, Phase- II, Delhi-110017
4.	Mr. Rakesh Kumar	Syamlal	B-46, 1st floor, Indira Park, East, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi
5.	Smt. Kanti Devi	W/o Late Sh. Ram Babu	B-104, Block B, Tigri Extn. Delhi-110062
6.	Sh. Jagannath	S/o Sh. Ram Bharose	C-34, Deepawali Enclave, Ismailpur Extn. Faridabad, Haryana-121003