

22

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CONT.CAS(C) 362/2017

RAJU SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kuamr, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

SH.PARTHASARATHY AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vinay Bist, Advocate with Mr. Alok
Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.1
and 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

ORDER

%

12.05.2017

Present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 20th February, 2017 passed in W.P.(C) 343/2017 wherein it was directed that the respondents shall verify whether the machineries in question purchased by the petitioner from the loan amount extended by the Bank were available at his premises. It was further directed that after due diligence, the petitioner shall be considered by the respondents-Bank for disbursal of balance loan amount towards the working capital, if satisfied.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the respondents have not complied with the aforesaid order till date.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent, who appears on advance notice, states that despite the personal visit by the bank officials, the

machineries have not been found at the site.

In rejoinder, learned counsel for petitioner controverts the said fact.

However, this Court is of the view that as the respondent states that machineries are not available at site, the present contempt petition is not maintainable.

Consequently, present contempt petition is closed.

However, the petitioner is given liberty to file appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

MANMOHAN, J

MAY 12, 2017

js