

(2025) 02 DEL CK 1151

In the Delhi High Court

Case No : Contempt Case (C) No. 34 Of 2025 & Civil Miscellaneous Petition No. 1790 Of 2025

Chetan Dayal

APPELLANT

Vs

District And Sessions Judge (Hqs) Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-02-2025

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2025) 02 DEL CK 1151

Hon'ble Judges : Manoj Jain, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Prince Bansal, Avnish Ahlawat, Nitesh Kumar Singh, Laavanya Kaushik, Aliza Alam, Mohnish Sehrawat, Amitoj Chadha

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Manoj Jain, J

CM APPL. 1790/2025 (exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CONT.CAS(C) 34/2025

1. Learned counsel for respondents appears on advance notice.
2. Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, learned Standing Counsel for GNCTD submits that in terms of the specific directions given by this Court vide order dated 13.09.2024 in W.P. (C) No. 12865/2024, the department has already taken a decision on 08.11.2024.
3. It is noticed that even petitioner is aware about the decision taken in this regard as along with the petition, he has placed on record a communication which he had received from the respondents in this regard.
4. It is noticed that while the decision was communicated to the petitioner few extracts of the Minutes of Selection Committee were mentioned therein which

perhaps led him to presume that such decision was not in consonance with the directions given by this Court.

5. During course of hearing and as directed by this Court, the complete Minutes of Meeting pertaining to the petitioner's grievance has been brought. Same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for petitioner.

6. It is noticed that while deciding the representation of the petitioner, the Committee considered the directions given by this Court on 13.09.2024. So much so, the relevant paragraphs of the aforesaid order have even been extracted in the aforesaid Minutes.

7. As per Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, learned Standing Counsel for GNCTD, even a personal hearing was given to the petitioner.

8. As per the directions contained in order dated 13.09.2024, respondents were directed to re-consider the representation and to pass a reasoned and speaking order. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved by decision taken by the respondents, it is always open to him to challenge the same by filing appropriate petition as permissible under law, but to say that respondents are in contempt of the aforesaid order would not be correct from any angle whatsoever.

9. In view of the above, present petition is disposed of without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the petitioner.

10. Needless to say, petitioner would be at liberty to take further remedial step as permissible under law.