

\$~S-1&2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.APP. (C) 27/2010, CRL.M.A.16138, 17898/2010, CM APPL.18253, 18254, 21346, 21348, 21349, 21350/2010, 2451, 2452, 3503, 3504, 3505, 3529, 4540 & 4541/2012**

VIKRAM BAKSHI & ORS Appellants
versus
SONIA KHOSLA & ORS Respondents

CONT.APP.(C) 28/2010, CM APPL.19086/2010, 4542 & 4543/12

VIKRAM BAKSHI & ORS Appellants
versus
SONIA KHOSLA & ORS Respondents

Present: Mr. Anand M. Mishra, Advocate for the appellants in both matters.

None for the respondents in both matters.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAJMI WAZIRI

ORDER

%

13.05.2016

The impugned order in these cases was made on 26.04.2010. Appeals have been preferred under Section 19 of the Contempt of Courts Act. A contempt appeal lies only where the order results in punishment. Clearly the order impugned in these cases did not result in a punishment of penalty; it contains certain observations and ended with a limited restraint order.

Given the fact that the impugned order was of limited duration, the Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in

continuing with the hearing of the appeal. However, since the order was made in the course of the interim proceedings, all rights and contentions of the parties to canvas as to the correctness of such observations are kept open.

The appeals are dismissed but with the above observations.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

NAJMI WAZIRI, J

MAY 13, 2016

/vikas/