



2025:DHC:8207



\$~64

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision: 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2025**

+ W.P.(C) 14193/2025, CM APPL. 58328/2025 &amp; CM APPL. 58329/2025

M/S SOPAN RESTAURANT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akshat Bajpai, Mr. Shobhit Trehan, Ms. Renuka Parmanand, Ms. Jayashree Mishra and Ms. Vedika Dalmia, Adv. (Through VC)

Mob: 7985177435

Email: [bajpaiakshat@gmail.com](mailto:bajpaiakshat@gmail.com)

versus

UNION OF INDIA &amp; ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jagdish Chandra, CGSC and Mr. Sujeet Kumar, GP, Adv.

**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondents to grant extension of seven months to the petitioner for *General Minor Unit ("GMU") No. NDLS-S-1 at Platform No. 1 behind booking hall at New Delhi Railway Station*, in terms of the order dated 10<sup>th</sup> January, 2025 in W.P.(C) 225/2025 and the judgment dated 30<sup>th</sup> May, 2024 in W.P.(C) 6771/2024.

2. This Court notes that the petitioner herein had earlier filed a petition with similar prayer, i.e., W.P.(C) 9674/2025, which was disposed of *vide* order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> August, 2025, in the following manner:



1. “The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondents to grant extension of a total of seven months to the petitioner for the General Minor Unit No. NDLS-S-1 at Platform No. 1, behind Booking Hall at New Delhi Railway Station, in terms of the order dated 10<sup>th</sup> January, 2025, in W.P.(C) 225/2025, and the judgment dated 30<sup>th</sup> May, 2024, in W.P.(C) 6771/2024.

2. Notice had been issued in the present matter on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025, and considering the submissions made before this Court, Status Quo had been directed to be maintained with regard to the stall in question, till the next date of hearing.

3. Today, learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the petitioner has not approached the respondents with any representation. He, thus, submits that the petitioner has approached this Court without even praying for relief from the respondents. He submits that the present petition can be treated as a representation.

4. Accordingly, considering the submissions made before this Court, let the present petition be treated as a representation made by the petitioner to the respondents.

5. At the time of considering the representation of the petitioner, the respondents shall give an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, through his authorized representative.

6. Upon considering the representation of the petitioner, a Speaking Order shall be passed, which shall be communicated to the petitioner.

7. Considering the fact that vide order dated 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025, this Court had directed maintenance of Status Quo as regards the stall in question, it is directed that during the pendency of the representation with the respondents, the Status Quo order as passed vide order dated 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025, by this Court, shall continue.

8. It is further directed that the Status Quo shall continue for another two weeks, after the representation of the petitioner is decided and communicated to the petitioner.

9. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved by any order passed by the respondents, the petitioner is at liberty to seek its remedies, in accordance with law.

10. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition, along with the pending application, stands disposed of.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the aforesaid order, a Speaking Order has been passed on behalf of the



respondent-Northern Railways dated 04<sup>th</sup> September, 2025, wherein, they have rejected the representation of the petitioner. Thus, it is submitted that since this Court on previous occasions has been passing various orders with respect to granting extension of seven months, therefore, similar prayer is being sought, on the grounds of parity.

4. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel appearing for the respondents, who submits that *vide* the Speaking Order dated 04<sup>th</sup> September, 2025, the prayer of the petitioner for extension has already been rejected.

5. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, this Court notes that *vide* order dated 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2025, in ***W.P.(C) 3474/2025***, titled as “***Shri Kishori Lal Versus Union of India and Others***”, this Court has, in similar circumstances, granted extension in favour of the petitioner therein.

6. Thus, considering the fact that similar orders have been passed on previous occasions also by this Court, thereby, granting an extension of time for running the stall, this Court is of the view that in parity with the orders passed earlier by this Court, a similar order ought to be passed in the present case as well. This Court sees no reason to take a different view from the orders passed earlier.

7. As regards the tenure of license in the present case, the petitioner was granted license with effect from 12<sup>th</sup> July, 2020, for a period of five years, which period expired on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025.

8. In view of the order passed by this Court in the earlier writ petition, i.e., order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> August, 2025 in ***W.P.(C) 9674/2025***, though the period of license of the petitioner has come to an end on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025, the petitioner has continued with the possession of the stall in question,



considering the *status quo* order granted by this Court.

9. Thus, the petitioner has already taken the benefit of extension from 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025 till date.

10. Accordingly, it is directed that subject to payment of license fees, the petitioner will be allowed to operate for *GMU No. NDLS-S-1 at Platform No. 1 behind booking hall at New Delhi Railway Station*, for a period of seven months, with effect from 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025, at stipulated license fees.

11. The petitioner is directed to file an undertaking, on an affidavit, before this Court, within a period of four weeks from today, that the petitioner shall vacate the stalls in question, on expiry of the extended period of 7 months, failing which, the respondents will be at liberty to remove the goods of the petitioner, from the stalls in question.

12. It is further made clear that extension of the license fees of the petitioner will not preclude the Railways from inviting fresh tenders, for awarding of the license, on expiry of the extended period of license of the petitioner.

13. Accordingly, with the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition, along with the pending applications, stands disposed of.

**MINI PUSHKARNA, J**

**SEPTEMBER 15, 2025/SK**