

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CONT.CAS(C) 48/2014

POOJA KAPOOR

Through

..... Petitioner

Ms. Kajal Sharma, Advocate

versus

RAJIV SOLANKI

Through

..... Respondent

Mr. Pramod Gupta with Ms. Kashvi
Dutta, Advocates**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN****ORDER**

%

07.02.2017

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the basic pay of the petitioner in November 2009 should have been Rs. 13,905/- and not Rs. 13,500/- as determined by the respondent-School.

Learned counsel for the respondent-School disputes the aforesaid averment.

This Court finds that there has been no determination by any Court that the petitioner's basic pay is Rs. 13,905/-. Consequently, this Court in the present contempt jurisdiction cannot ask the respondent to pay the petitioner basic pay of Rs. 13,905/- and consequential allowances thereof.

Accordingly, present contempt petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the basic pay fixed by the respondent in accordance with law. However, it is clarified that this Court has not

expressed any opinion on the merits of the controversy. The rights and contentions of all the parties are left open.

MANMOHAN, J

FEBRUARY 07, 2017

rn