



\$~39

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

Date of decision: 20th July, 2026

Uploaded on: 21st July, 2026

+

W.P.(C) 6429/2026

SUNITA DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya, Mr. Vipin Kumar, Mr. Anjani Kr. Mishra, Ms. Pralika Chakraborty, Mr. Fareeduddin & Ms. Srejal Mishra, Advs. (M: 8699723746)

Versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF
DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Meherunnisa A. Jaitley & Mr. Aryan Tyagi, Advs. for R-1 & 4. (M: 9717100486)
Mr. Chiranjiv Kumar, Mr. Nring Chamwibo Zeliang, Advs. with SI Nitesh PS Sagarpur for R-2 & 3. (M: 8730027929)
Ms. Urvi Mohan, Panel Counsel for GNCTD.

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- Ms. Sunita Devi under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, seeking directions to the Respondents to allow the Petitioner to peacefully vend from the vending



site *i.e.*, on the open space, Gandhi Market Chowk, opposite police booth, West Sagarpur Najafgarh Zone, Ward S-31, New Delhi (*hereinafter, the vending site*’).

3. The case of the Petitioner is that she is a street vendor who has been vending from the vending site for several years.

4. The Petitioner has been issued a Certificate of Vending (hereinafter, ‘CoV’) bearing **URI No.2459556** under the category of ‘**Others**’ for vending at Najafgarh Zone, Ward- S-31.

5. The Petitioner is running a small vend from the vending site, where she sells clothes, apparel, and other similar items.

6. The photograph of Petitioner’s vend is set out below:



2026:DHC:5776-08





2026:DHC:5776-08



7. The grievance of the Petitioner is that she is not being allowed to



peacefully vend from the vending site and her business activities are being repeatedly obstructed by the concerned officials of the Delhi Police and Municipal Corporation of Delhi (*hereinafter*, 'MCD'), despite having a CoV.

8. On 13th July, 2026, Ms. Meherunnisa A. Jaitely, Id. Counsel for the MCD was requested to accept notice in the matter and was directed to seek instructions.

9. Today, Id. Counsel for the MCD has placed on record certain photographs showing that the Petitioner's vending site is situated at the entrance of Gandhi Market. According to her, the MCD has not interfered with the Petitioner's vending activities, and any obstruction or disturbance appears to have been caused by the Market Association.

10. Heard. After having perused the record, it is clear that the CoV of the Petitioner is under the category of '**Others**'. Thus, the Petitioner has to operate as a mobile vendor.

11. However, the Petitioner is operating from a temporary stationary vend, which would be contrary to the terms and conditions of the CoV.

12. At this stage, Id. Counsel for the Petitioner submits that his client is willing to convert her vend into mobile vend.

13. Under these circumstances, it is directed that the Petitioner shall operate her vend as a mobile vend, either as a mobile cart or in some other form.

14. Further, the Petitioner shall also ensure that no obstruction is caused at the entry of the Gandhi market, in any manner whatsoever.

15. Subject to aforesaid and subject to the Petitioner adhering to the terms and conditions of the CoV, her vending activities shall not be disturbed.



16. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Pending applications, if any, are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE

VIKAS MAHAJAN
JUDGE

JULY 20, 2026/*dk/sm*