

\$~64

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 71/2016**

ANWAR AHMED Petitioner
Through Mr. Dinesh S. Badiar, Adv.

versus

A K PATHAK & ORS Respondents
Through Mr. V.S.R. Krishna, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

% **14.07.2017**

CM No. 24442/2017 (early hearing)

Heard. Allowed.

CONT.CAS(C) 71/2016

Instant contempt petition came to be filed on the premise that the respondents have violated the order datd 18.5.2015 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in WP(C) 4890/2015, which reads as under:

“After some arguments, counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to file a representation to the respondents with the request to at least consider the case of the petitioner for charging normal rent for the period w.e.f. 24.04.2001 to 13.01.2005.

Reserving the said liberty of filing the representation, the present writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. We only need to state that on filing of such representation by the petitioner, the respondents may take a sympathetic view on his representation. It is further clarified that any fresh decision taken by the respondents on the representation of the

petitioner, the same will not entitle the petitioner to start litigation on this issue again.”

On being queried, ld. counsel for the respondents does not dispute the fact that on the representation made, the respondents have decided the representation. When that is so, the compliance of the order is fully met with. Contempt petition is wholly misconceived and dismissed.

A. K. CHAWLA, J

JULY 14, 2017

rc