

\$~13

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ W.P.(C) 3099/2020 and CM No. 10763/2020  
ANURAG CHAUHAN ..... Petitioner  
Through: Mr.Anurag Chauhan, Advocate  
versus  
UNION OF INDIA ..... Respondent  
Through: Ms.Shobhana Takiar, Advocate for  
GNCTD  
Mr.Gaurang Kanth, Advocate for  
UOI

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW  
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL**

**O R D E R**

**%**

**11.05.2020**

**[VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING]**

1. The petitioner, a practicing Advocate of this court, who has in almost 6 years of his professional life already filed five public interest litigations, has filed this public interest litigation, seeking a direction to the respondent to take effective measures to provide financial aid including food, shelter and medicines etc., to sex workers, lesbians, bisexuals, gay and transgender people in Delhi, for their survival during the Covid-19 pandemic; constitution of a Committee for their rehabilitation has also been sought. The petitioner has also sought steps for exemption of rent of such of such persons who are living as tenants in Delhi.

2. To say the least, the petition is filed without any ground work and without any thought to it. When we asked the counsel for the petitioner, for whose benefit the petition has been filed and how such people/persons are to be identified, he had no clue and appears to be thunderstruck by the question.

When asked, whether any separate register is maintained of such persons, as indeed cannot be, again the petitioner has no idea. We asked the Petitioner, whether such persons would come forward to identify themselves; he is again unable to say anything whatsoever except for stating that such task should also be assigned to the respondent.

3. With respect to the relief of suspension of rent, their landlords have not been impleaded and the petitioner, inspite of being an Advocate, has not thought, how an order of suspension of rent payable by such persons to others can be passed in the absence of such others.

4. Though the rules framed by this court with respect to PILs require the petitioner to not only disclose earlier PILs filed but also outcome thereof but the petitioner, paying mere lip service to the said requirement, has pleaded that the earlier PILs filed by him have been “disposed off”. He is even now not telling whether the earlier petitions have been dismissed.

5. The respondent as well as the state governments have already brought out several schemes to alleviate hardship to the citizens in the wake of Covid-19. The Supreme Court and other courts have also issued directions wherever required. The persons for whose benefit this petition has been filed are also entitled to such schemes and the benefit of the directions and it is not the case that they are being discriminated against.

6. This PIL thus deserves to be dismissed with costs.

7. The petitioner at this stage seeks to withdraw this petition.

8. Considering the young age of the petitioner, we allow him to withdraw the petition and refrain from imposing costs on him but on the condition that the petitioner, if files any other public interest litigation in his

name or on behalf of anybody else, to file a copy of this order alongwith the said PIL and mention this order prominently, in the synopsis as well as in the body of such fresh petition if any.

**RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.**

**SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL, J**

**MAY 11, 2020 / SU**

*W.P.(C) 3099/2020*

*Page 3 of 3*