



\$~35

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

Date of decision: 17th August, 2026

Uploaded on: 19th August, 2026

CNR No. DLHC010213752026

+ **W.P.(C) 6547/2026**

RAVINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vipin Kumar, Adv.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI

AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Meherunnisa A. Jaitley, Mr. Aryan Tyagi & Mr. Jaskeerat Singh
Advs. for R-1 and 2.

Mr. Sandeep Chaudhary, Adv. for R-4
and 5.

Ms. Mahika Bisht, Adv. for Ms. Urvi
Mohan, Adv. for GNCTD.

Insp. Gyan Prakash, SI Ankit Tomar,
PS Kotwali.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

Prathiba M. Singh, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioner-Ravinder Singh, who is a vendor, *inter alia*, seeking issuance of an appropriate writ directing the Respondents to allow the Petitioner to peacefully vend at his designated spot i.e., on the footpath alongside Jain Sports Club boundary wall, Netaji Subhash Marg, Ward-84, New Delhi (*hereinafter*, 'the vending site').



3. On the last date of hearing, Id. Counsel for the Respondents had submitted that the vending site lies in a 'Non-Vending Zone'. In addition, Id. Counsel for the Respondent No.4- Commissioner of Police, Delhi Police and Respondent No. 5- SHO, PS. Kotwali had also submitted that the Petitioner is not working from his vend and is running a shop in Lajpat Nagar, being Shop No. 84.
4. Accordingly, the MCD, as well as the SHO, PS Kotwali were directed to file their status reports in this regard.
5. Today, a status report has been handed over by the SHO, PS Kotwali, and the MCD. The status reports are taken on record.
6. The Court has perused the said status reports. As per the SHO, PS Kotwali, the Petitioner is working as a Supervisor at 1st Floor, Shop No. 84, New Lajpat Rai Chandni Chowk for the last 7 years. The CCTV footage for the last one month has also been submitted by the police.
7. Thus, the allegation that the police are troubling the Petitioner is stated to be incorrect.
8. Insofar as the MCD is concerned, the status report has been filed stating that the Petitioner's vending site was inspected by MCD officials on 29th and 30th July, 2026 and there was no vend.
9. A perusal of the petition would show that at 'Annexure P-2', some pictures have been annexed wherein a vend has been shown in a temporary manner. However, clearly, there appears to be no vend which was being run by the Petitioner at the said spot, pursuant to the CoV No. URI 6847684, issued under the category 'food/snack with gas cylinder fire'. .
10. In the opinion of this Court, the Petitioner has not come to the Court with clean hands, as he is not working as a vendor as per the MCD and the



local police for several years but these facts have not been revealed to the Court by the Petitioner. It is now conceded by Id. Counsel for the Petitioner that the Petitioner ran his vend till 2022 or so. On being queried as to how he placed a photograph showing a vend, in the writ petition, it is submitted that the said photograph was taken for the purposes of filing this petition. Clearly, the Petitioner is guilty of concealment of material facts and is not entitled to relief.

11. But since the Petitioner has a provisional CoV, if the Petitioner wishes to start running any vend, which would obviously not be in a non-vending zone, the Petitioner is free to approach the concerned Assistant Commissioner, MCD, for allocation of a vending site.

12. With these observations, the petition is disposed of. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE

VIKAS MAHAJAN
JUDGE

AUGUST 17, 2026

dj/ss