

9 to 12

\$~

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 635/2015

RAJEEV GUPTA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Shahid Ali, Advocate with
Mr. Mohd. Shariq and Mr. Meeraj
Ansari, Advocates.

versus

LALIT KUMAR ARORA Respondent
Through: Mr. Ajeet Pandey, Advocate with
respondent in person.

With

+ CONT.CAS(C) 636/2015

RAJEEV GUPTA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Shahid Ali, Advocate with
Mr. Mohd. Shariq and Mr. Meeraj
Ansari, Advocates.

versus

AJAY CHOPRA Respondent
Through: Mr. Ajeet Pandey, Advocate with
respondent in person.

With

+ CONT.CAS(C) 637/2015

RAJEEV GUPTA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Shahid Ali, Advocate with
Mr. Mohd. Shariq and Mr. Meeraj
Ansari, Advocates.

versus

RAJ KUMAR PAHWA Respondent
Through: Mr. Ajeet Pandey, Advocate with
respondent in person.

And

+ CONT.CAS(C) 639/2015

RAJEEV GUPTA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Shahid Ali, Advocate with
Mr. Mohd. Shariq and Mr. Meeraj
Ansari, Advocates.

versus

DALIP CHOPRA Respondent
Through: Mr. Ajeet Pandey, Advocate with
respondent in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

ORDER
05.10.2015

%
Present contempt petitions have been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 12th December, 2014 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in review petitions as well as undertakings dated 12th January, 2015 wherein respondents had undertaken to vacate the tenanted premises bearing property No.1, Krishna Market, Lajpat Nagar-I, New Delhi-110024 by 31st July, 2015 and had further undertaken to continue to pay the rent, electricity and water charges till the time the tenanted premises were occupied by the respondents.

On the last date of hearing, learned counsel for petitioner had stated that respondents have not only failed to pay the aforesaid charges, but they have also failed to vacate the premises.

Today, learned counsel for petitioner states that in execution proceedings the respondents have been evicted.

In response to the notices issued by this Court, respondents are personally present.

Learned counsel for respondents unconditionally apologizes for the conduct of the respondents. He, however, seeks mercy on the ground that respondents are senior citizens.

Since the respondents have admittedly breached the undertaking as well as the consensual order, this Court is of the view that respondents are guilty of contempt.

However, keeping in view their age and the fact that they have tendered their apology on the first date of hearing itself, respondents are imposed a fine of Rs.2,000/- each. The fine shall be deposited within a period of four weeks.

With the aforesaid direction, present contempt petitions stand disposed of.


MANMOHAN, J

OCTOBER 05, 2015

js