

22

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ CONT.CAS(C) 190/2017

NEETU GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shakil Akhtar, Advocate.

versus

YOGESH HANDA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

ORDER

%

03.03.2017

CM Appl. 8658/2017 (exemption) in Cont.Cas(C) 190/2017

Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

Cont.Cas(C) 190/2017 & CM Appl. 8657/2017

Present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of order dated 02nd May, 2016 passed in W.P.(C) 3650/2016 and order dated 26th July, 2016 passed in Cont.Cas(C) 864/2016. In the alternate, petitioner prays for a direction to respondents to pay Rs.90 lacs for causing damage to the petitioner's business.

By virtue of the aforesaid orders, electronic shops No.11, 12, 14 and 17 at Vayusenabad were allotted to the petitioner.

It has been averred in the petition that though petitioner was allotted the aforesaid shops in a tender for a period of one year i.e. from 01st April, 2016 till 31st March, 2017, but the contracts with respect to Shops No.14 and

17 was executed on 01st June, 2016 and with respect to Shops No.11 and 12 on 01st August, 2016.

Learned counsel for petitioner states that the tenure of one year would start when the contracts with the respect to the shops were executed. He points out that respondents have issued fresh tender notices with regard to all the shops in question for the period commencing 01st April, 2017.

In the opinion of this Court, no contempt lies as no period of license was stipulated in the orders passed by this Court. In fact, it is clearly stated in the contract agreement that the shops are given to the petitioner till 31st March, 2017.

Consequently, this Court is of the view that the present contempt petition and application are not maintainable and the same are accordingly dismissed.

MANMOHAN, J

MARCH 03, 2017

js