



2025:DHC:8078



\$~80

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision: 10<sup>th</sup> September, 2025**+ **W.P.(C) 12113/2025 & CM APPL. 49395/2025****CHAUHAN PATTI RESIDENTS WELFARE ASSOCIATION  
(REGD.)** .....PetitionerThrough: Mr. Abhay Mani Tripathi, Mr.  
Suryans Agarwal, Ms. Monika  
Tiwari, Advs.  
Mob: 9193937196  
Email: [mani.abhay@gmail.com](mailto:mani.abhay@gmail.com)

versus

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI AND  
ORS.** .....RespondentsThrough: Mr. Daljeet Dhiman and Mr.  
Shubham Thakur, Advs. for R-5,  
along with R-5 in person.  
Mob: 9811640373  
Email: [daljeet\\_dhiman@yahoo.com](mailto:daljeet_dhiman@yahoo.com)  
Mr. Tushar Sannu, SC for MCD with  
Mr. Parvin Bansal and Mr. Vishal Ji,  
Advs. for R-MCD  
Mob: 9911991166**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (ORAL):**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondent nos. 1 to 4, to revoke the permission granted *vide* letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2025 issued in favour of respondent no. 5, and grant permission to the petitioner for organising Ramleela and Dussera, religious and cultural event from 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2025 to 03<sup>rd</sup> October, 2025, at the *Veer Savarkar Complex, Karawal Nagar, New Delhi-110094*.



2. It is the case on behalf of the petitioner that the respondent nos. 1 to 4- Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“MCD”) did not decide the application of the petitioner society for allotment of the venue, i.e., *Veer Sarvarkar Complex, Karawal Nagar, Delhi-110094* for organising Ramleela and Dussera religious and cultural event. Instead, the said venue has been allotted to respondent no. 5 *vide* letter dated 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2025, for the same period and purpose, despite the fact that the petitioner had submitted its application much prior to respondent no 5.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner draws the attention of this Court to the application of respondent no. 5, wherein, the said application is dated 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2025, but received on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2025. Thus, it is submitted that the application of the respondent no. 5 was not received on 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2025, as averred by respondent no. 5.

4. He submits that the respondent no. 5 was removed by the petitioner from its association on account of financial irregularities. It is further submitted that the petitioner has held Ramleela and Dussera Events at the site in question for the last two years and respondent no. 5 was constituted, only in March, 2025.

5. It is further submitted by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the application of respondent no. 5 was initially rejected by the MCD. Therefore, application of the petitioner ought to have been allowed. Thus, the *malafide* of the MCD is apparent from the record and the petitioner has not been treated fairly.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-MCD submits that the initial permission granted to respondent no. 5 was revoked on 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2025, as the same had been issued without obtaining



permission from the competent authority. It is submitted that subsequently approval was granted, after taking approval from the competent authority. Since the application of respondent no. 5 was received at prior point of time, the same was considered and allowed.

7. On behalf of respondent no. 5, it is submitted that the President of the petitioner association, i.e., Sanjeev Tomar, was expelled from the respondent no. 5-committee and the petitioner was associated with respondent no. 5, which fact, has not been disclosed in the writ petition.

8. It is further submitted that President of respondent no. 5, i.e., Yashpal Sharma was never part of the petitioner association, and the petitioner applied to the respondent-MCD, on the basis of the policy of the MCD, therefore, permission was duly granted to the respondent no. 5.

9. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, this Court takes note of the submission made by learned counsel appearing for the respondent-MCD that the application of the respondent no. 5 dated 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2025, seeking permission for conduct of religious function at the site in question was received on 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2025. He has handed over to this Court copy of the receipt register of the MCD, wherein, the entry in this regard is duly made. He further submits that copy of the said application was again handed over by respondent no. 5 in May, 2025, on account of which another receipt was given for the said date. However, the application of the respondent no. 5 was actually received on 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2025.

10. This Court further takes note of the submission made by learned counsel appearing for the respondent-MCD that the initial permission was withdrawn only on account of the fact that approval of the competent authority had not been taken by the MCD before issuing the permission



letter. It is to be noted that the said inadvertence of not taking approval from the competent authority was a laxity on the part of the MCD and the respondent no. 5 had no connection in regard thereto. Thus, subsequently after removing the anomaly and taking the requisite approval from the competent authority, permission letter was duly issued by the MCD in favour of respondent no. 5.

11. In this regard, affidavit dated 08<sup>th</sup> September, 2025 of the MCD, reads as under:

“xxx xxx xxx

5. That therequest for permission to organise the Ram leela was received from Yashpal Sharma/ Respondent no.5on 19.02.2025. After examining the documents and on 'First-come First-serve' basis, he was granted permission for organising the Ram Leela on 12.06.2025. Copy of the letter of Respondent No.5 dated 19.02.2025 is annexed as Annexure R/A
6. However, the initial permission letter was revoked on 18.06.2025 as it was issued without obtaining approval from the Competent Authority, and was thus rendered invalid. Subsequently, on 15.07.2025, after obtaining the necessary approval, a fresh permission letter was issued. Copy of the permission letter dated 15.07.2025 is annexed as Annexure R/B
7. In response to the specific query put forth by this Hon'ble Courtvide order dated 12.08.2025, it is submitted thatas per e-PAN card, certificate (section 60) and Trust deed of Respondent no.5, the date of incorporation/formation of "Shri Ram Leela Committee Karawal Nagar Gaon Delhi" is 03.03.2025. Copy of e-PAN card, certificate (section 60) and Trust deed of Respondent no.5 is annexed as Annexure R/C (Collv.)

xxx xxx xxx”

12. This Court also takes note of the submission of the MCD that the applications for organising Ramleela and other religious functions, are



considered on ‘First-Come-First-Serve’ basis. Thus, considering the fact that the application of respondent no. 5 dated 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2025, was initially received on 25<sup>th</sup> February, 2025, and the application of the petitioner dated 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2025 was received by the MCD only on 28<sup>th</sup> May, 2025, it is clear that the application of respondent no. 5 preceded the application of the petitioner. Therefore, in view of the fact that the application of respondent no. 5 was received at prior point of time, this Court finds no error in the permission granted to the respondent no. 5.

13. There is no legal vested right in any party for claiming permission for holding of any religious function, as the same is governed by the policy of the MCD, on ‘First-Come-First-Serve’ basis. Evidently, the petitioner’s application is subsequent to the application of the respondent no. 5 in this regard. Thus, there is no legal right in favour of the petitioner, which can be said to have been violated by the MCD. In this regard, reference may be made to the judgment in the case of *Sri. Awadh Ram Leela Committee Vashnu Mata Mandir and Another Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi and Others*, 2024 SCC OnLine Del 4970, wherein, it has been held as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

**32. With regard to the above, this Court is of the considered view that there is sufficient authority as per which in order to grant relief as prayed by the petitioners in the present petition, there has to be a legal right in their favour which has been violated by a public authority by not fulfilling the obligation which it ought to have done. In other words, a writ of mandamus can be granted only in a case where there is a statutory duty imposed upon the authority concerned and there is a failure on the part of that authority to discharge the statutory obligation.**

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)



14. Reference may also be made to judgment in the case of ***Lav-Kush Ramlila Committee Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi and Ors, MANU/DE/0787/2003***, wherein, it has been held that no party has a vested right in the use of a ground for holding Ramleela and that one must not lose sight of the public character of Ramleela celebration. Thus, it has been held as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

12. The initiative in the resolution of the dispute pertaining to the allotment of the Ram Lila Grounds, in my considered view, lies with the M.C.D. **Neither of the Committees has a vested right in the user of the Ram Lila Ground although the Respondent Committee would have preference keeping in perspective its long and consecutive user. Its allotment is subject to the availability of the Grounds and considerations of public order and safety.** No doubt some legitimate expectations, if not contractual rights, had been created on the allotment of half of the Ram Lila Grounds to each of the rival Committees. **One must not lose sight of the public character of Ram Lila celebration. Neither of the Committees can be heard to say that it is their private enterprise, since the primary objective must be the participation of the public at large.** If the Standing Committee of the M.C.D. has considered it expedient to recall the decision of the Asstt. Director (Horticulture) dated 29.8.2003, inter alia, for the reason that the holding of two Ram Lilas at the Ram Lila Ground is not possible being dangerous to public safety, and the possibility of a clash between two Ram Lilas, especially of the procession, it would not be appropriate for the Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution, to come to a contrary conclusion, given these apprehensions, and the fact that the Respondent Committee has undisputedly been organising Ram Lilas at this very site for over half a century and that the Petitioner Committee had in the past years held its celebrations in the Red Fort area. However, it has not been shown that the decision of allotment emanated from the Commissioner. Furthermore, it has also not been disclosed whether any decision was taken at the proposed meeting of the Coordination Committee which was to be held on 25.8.2003. So far as monetary loss is considered it can always be compensated for and the Petitioner Committee can avail of its legal remedies in this regard.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

15. This Court also takes note of the documents which clearly show that



permission for previous years for holding the Ramleela in the area in question, had been granted in favour of petitioner.

16. It is also to be noted that mere fact that initial permission dated 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2025 granted to respondent no. 5 was revoked on 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2025, does not have the effect of the application of the respondent no. 5, being rendered invalid. As noted above, the said approval was revoked only on account of technical hindrance regarding approval of the competent authority not having been taken. Thus, this Court does not agree with the submission made on behalf of the petitioner that after the permission to respondent no. 5 had been revoked on 18<sup>th</sup> June, 2025, the application of the petitioner ought to have been allowed. There is no basis for making such a submission. This Court finds no error in the action of the MCD in granting due permission to the respondent no. 5 after seeking approval from the competent authority, when it is undisputed that the application of the respondent no. 5 predated the application of the petitioner.

17. Considering the aforesaid detailed discussion, no merit is found in the present petition.

18. The present petition, along with the pending applications, is accordingly dismissed.

**MINI PUSHKARNA, J**

**SEPTEMBER 10, 2025**

ak