



\$~33

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

Date of Decision: 22nd July, 2026

Uploaded on: 23rd July, 2026

+ **W.P.(C) 9966/2026 & CM APPL.46408/2026**

DHARAMVEER & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ramesh Kumar Mishra, Mr
Shivam Tiwary & Mr. Saket
Bhardwaj, Adv. (M: 7739506771)

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF
DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Puja S. Kalra, Standing Counsel,
MCD with Mr. Virendra Singh, Adv.
Ms. Neha Rastogi, Sr. Panel Counsel
with Mr. Rajat Dubey, Adv. for R-4 &
5. (M: 7289869290)

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 four Petitioners, who had filed their nominations for contesting in the forthcoming elections of Town Vending Committee (TVC), which is scheduled to be held on 2nd August, 2026.
3. The stand of the Petitioners is that their nominations have been rejected by the MCD and their names are not reflected in the final list of candidates. The categories, under which each of the Petitioners is seeking to contest the elections, is as under:



- | | | | |
|-------|--------------------|---|---|
| (i) | Dharamveer | - | Persons with Disability Category |
| (ii) | Juggi Lal | - | Scheduled Caste Category certificate issued in UP |
| (iii) | Rakesh Kumar Yadav | - | OBC Category certificate issued in UP |
| (iv) | Samsuddin Sheikh | - | Minority Category |

4. Submission of Mr. Mishra, Id. Counsel appearing for the Petitioners is that in terms of the Street Vendor (Protection of Livelihood & Regulation of Street Vending) Rules, 2017, as per Clause 8 of the Schedule, whenever a nomination is examined by the concerned Returning Officer, summary inquiry has to be held and there cannot be any rejection merely on the ground of incorrect description of name of the candidate/proposer/seconder.

5. It is further submitted that the reasons for rejection has to be given by the Returning Officer in terms of Clause 8(iv) of the Schedule.

6. Thus, the case of the Petitioners is that in the present case, neither the inquiry was conducted, nor the reason for rejection has been recorded and the final list of the candidates has been published.

7. Insofar as Petitioner No.1 is concerned, according to the Id. Counsel for the Petitioners, there was an error in the name of the Petitioner, due to which it appears that the nomination has been rejected. Insofar as the Petitioner No.4 is concerned, the proposer/seconder was from a different ward, hence he has been informed that his nomination has been rejected.

8. It is further his submission that the decision to reject nomination deserves to be quashed and a reasonable opportunity of at least 15 days or any short period ought to be given to all the candidates, whose names have been rejected.



9. Ms. Kalra, Id. Counsel appearing for the MCD on the other hand submits that schedule for elections of the TVCs has already been notified. The same is as under:

Commencement of Nomination Process	03 July 2026 (From 11:00 AM to 03:00 PM)
Last Date for Submission of Nomination Forms	10 July 2026
Last Date for Withdrawal of Nomination	11 July 2026 (Up to 05:00 PM)
Scrutiny of Nomination Forms	11 July 2026 (Up to 05:00 PM)
Publication of Valid Nominations	11 July 2026 (After 05:00 PM)
Allotment of Election Symbols	13 July 2026 (Before 05:00 PM)
Publication of Final List of Candidates	13 July 2026 (Up to 05:00 PM)
Polling Day	02 August 2026 (From 08:00 AM to 05:00 PM)
Counting of Votes & Declaration of Result	04 August 2026 (From 08:00 AM onwards)

10. In terms thereof, the polling is scheduled on 2nd August, 2026 and the final list of candidates has also been published. It is her further submission that in **SLP(C) Nos. 26311-26312/2019** titled **Saptahik Merchant Welfare Association (Registered) v. North Delhi Municipal Corporation & Ors.**, the Supreme Court in its order dated 6th April, 2026 had directed re-constitution of the TVC itself within a period of two months. Hence, the MCD is trying its best to proceed expeditiously to conclude the elections of the TVC.

11. She further submits that insofar as the Petitioners are concerned, the Returning Officer had, in fact, called them in person to try to resolve the anomalies in their nomination application. However, since two of the Petitioners did not have proper certification of their respective categories in Delhi, the nominations were rejected.

12. Id. Counsel for the Petitioners submits that the said two candidates,



who had filed their nominations under the category of OBC, SC etc., are also willing to contest as general candidates. On this issue, Ms. Kalra was requested to seek instructions in the pre-lunch session.

13. Ms. Kalra, Id. Counsel has reverted and she submits that after rejection of nomination, ballot papers have also been printed. Hence, the Petitioners cannot be added as candidates anymore.

14. The Court has heard Counsels for the parties. Given this background, it can be seen from the schedule of TVC elections extracted above, that the scrutiny of nomination forms took place between 11th to 13th July, 2026. The final list of candidates was also to be published on 13th July, 2026. The polling day is now 2nd August, 2026, which is almost approaching.

15. The TVC elections are extremely crucial elections as there has been a substantial delay in the constitution of TVCs in Delhi, leading to several issues arising with respect to street vendors across Delhi.

16. The same is also important in the context of the role played by the TVC for finalization of certificates of vending for thousands of vendors in Delhi. Thus these elections, in the opinion of this Court, ought not to be interdicted and held up due to grievances raised by any individual candidates. If such grievances are entertained at this stage, it may completely disrupt the election process itself, which is not feasible, especially after Ballot papers are printed.

17. Moreover, the Supreme Court in ***Saptahik Merchant Welfare Association (Registered) (supra)***, vide order dated 6th April, 2026 has directed as under:

“1. Learned counsel appearing for the parties have been heard at length.

2. We direct reconstitution of the Town Vending Committee as envisaged in the Street Vendors (Protection



of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014 by the competent authority as per terms of the aforesaid enactment, within a period of two months from date of service of a copy of this order. However, such reconstitution is not intended for the purpose of permitting the members of the petitioning Association to resume vending on Netaji Subhash Marg, New Delhi but for the purpose of their re-location to some other appropriate place for vending.

3. Once the TVC is re-constituted, decision to identify the vendors and to re-locate them shall be taken at the earliest but not later than six months from the date of reconstitution thereof.”

18. The above order also clearly directs that the TVC elections and re-constitution ought to be conducted within a period of two months. This Court is also entertaining several writ petitions where street vendors seek their permanent certificates of vending and the said decisions are now awaiting constitution of TVCs.

19. Under these circumstances, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present writ petition, at this stage of elections of TVCs.

20. Accordingly, the petition, along with pending applications, is dismissed at this stage.

21. Needless to add, the Petitioners are free to avail of their remedies in accordance with law after the elections are concluded.

**PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE**

**VIKAS MAHAJAN
JUDGE**

JULY 22, 2026/dk/ss