

\$~55

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 444/2016

PHILOMEENA AHMED & ANR ..... Petitioners  
Through Ms. Amra Moosavi, Ms. Naghma  
Imtiaz, Advs. for Mr. Imtiaz Ahmed,  
Advs.

versus

SHRI LOKESH JHA, THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER,  
RESIDENT COMMISSION GOVT OF JAMMU  
AND KASHMIR & ORS ..... Respondents  
Through

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.R. MIDHA**

**ORDER**

% **25.04.2016**

1. Vide order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2015, this Court directed the respondent to treat the writ petition as representation and decide the same within a period of four weeks by passing a speaking order and to communicate the same to the petitioner within a period of one week thereafter to enable the petitioners' to avail appropriate legal remedies available to them in law.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent passed the order dated 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2016 against which the petitioner has preferred a fresh writ petition which is pending.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2015 was served on the respondent on 6<sup>th</sup> January, 2016 and the four weeks' period granted by the Court on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2015 expired on 6<sup>th</sup> February, 2016 whereas the speaking order has been passed on 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2016. As such, there is a delay of 24 days in passing the speaking

order.

4. This Court has therefore, not inclined to invoke Section 11 of the Contempts of Courts Act only on the ground of delay of 24 days in passing the speaking order.

5. The petition is therefore, dismissed.

**J.R. MIDHA, J.**

**APRIL 25, 2016**

dk