

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

7.

+

W.P.(C) 3852/2012

AJAY KUMAR GUPTA AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Dr. Prabhat Kumar, Advocate.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF CENTRAL EXCISE

INTELLIGENCE AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Katyal, Advocate.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

16.02.2016

%

1. Since July 2014 the matter has been adjourned on four occasions at the instance of the Petitioners.

2. Today learned counsel for the Petitioners states that there is a case pending in the Supreme Court, the outcome of which will have a bearing on the reliefs sought in the present petition. He seeks one more adjournment.

3. Considering that this petition has been pending for nearly four years, the Court does not see any purpose being served in keeping this petition pending. The first prayer in this petition is for the return of the cash seized by the Respondents in a search operation. With the Petitioners themselves stating that the decision on such prayer would have to await the disposal of

the pending case in the Supreme Court, the Court feels appropriate to permit the Petitioners to seek appropriate remedies in that behalf after disposal of the case by the Supreme Court.

4. As far as the other prayer for a direction to the Respondents to act upon the orders of the Settlement Commission is concerned, since the said order of the Settlement Commission is the subject matter of challenge before the Supreme Court, that prayer too cannot be granted by the Court at this stage.

5. The writ petition is disposed of in the above terms.

S. MURALIDHAR, J

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

FEBRUARY 16, 2016/dn