

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

Review Petition No.115 of 2010 & C.M. Appl. No.4656 of 2010 in
Cont. Cas. (C) No.117 of 2010

%

15.03.2010

S.N. SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. V. Sudeer, Advocate.

Versus

R.K. SINHA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. V.P. Singh, Sr. Advocate with Mr. J.S.
Rupal & Mr. Jitender Khanna, Advocates.

Date of Reserve: 12th March, 2010

Date of Order: 15th March, 2010

JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

J U D G M E N T

1. The petitioner has filed this review petition seeking review of order of this court dated 22nd February, 2010.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this court while passing order dated 22nd February, 2010 had, in fact, varied and changed the directions given by the Division Bench in its order dated 18th May, 2009.

3. I consider that this averment made by the petitioner is baseless. In order dated 18th May, 2009, the petitioner had given an assurance to the court that he will cooperate with the inquiry and also assured the court that he would not issue any letter contrary to existing rules and shall avoid all administrative controversies. Counsel for the

respondents had given assurance to the court that University will furnish the documents asked for by the petitioner in its letter dated 8th May, 2009 as well as 24th April, 2009, if not already supplied.

4. In the order dated 22nd February, 2010, this court observed the nature of documents which were being asked by the petitioner from the respondent and found that the petitioner cannot refuse to participate in the inquiry on the ground of non-supply of the documents as given in annexure attached with the contempt petition and petitioner can very well represent before the Inquiry Committee and Inquiry Committee can take appropriate decision regarding supply of documents and which documents were relevant and necessary for inquiry. This court did not vary or change the order passed by the Division Bench.

5. This review petition seems to be another effort by the petitioner to impede the inquiry which is now fixed for 22nd March, 2010. It has also been brought to my notice by counsel for the respondents, who appeared on advance notice that the petitioner had filed a writ petition being W.P. (C) No.1093 of 2010 for similar relief before another Bench of this court giving reference of the order dated 22nd February, 2010, which was dismissed on 9th March, 2010. The petitioner had in his review petition not disclosed this fact.

6. I consider that this review petition deserves to be dismissed with exemplary cost. The review petition is hereby dismissed with cost of Rs.20,000/-.

SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA J.

MARCH 15, 2010
‘AA’