

\$~4

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 601/2015**

PUSHPA SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through

Mr. Sanjay Mani Tripathi, Adv. with
Mr. Suraj Singh and Mr. Vishal
Tewari, Advs.

versus

S N SINGH & ORS

..... Respondents

Through

Mr. Mukesh Kher, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

%

23.01.2020

CM APPL. 2906/2019 (for directions)

The contempt petition was disposed of vide order dated 11.01.2018,
which, reads as follows:

“ 11.01.2018

CONT.CAS(C) 601/2015

Learned counsel for the parties agree that the contempt petition can be disposed of subject to petitioner submitting an indemnity bond in terms of order dated December 22, 2016 in this court and to the School and pursuant thereto, the outstanding salary of the petitioner for the period between November, 2012 to March 12, 2015 shall be released within one month thereafter. Ordered accordingly. I may note, even though the order dated December 22, 2016 states, if the departmental proceedings are finally held that the petitioner is not entitled to the wages for the said period, the amount shall be refunded back along with interest @ 3% per annum and there is no dispute that the Directorate of Education has not accepted the departmental proceedings against the petitioner, I take on record the statement of Mr. Kher, the School shall seek judicial remedy against the order of the Directorate

within a period of two months from today and if no remedy is sought within two months from today, the indemnity bond submitted by the petitioner shall be automatically stand revoked.

The petition is disposed of.

CM. No. 41959/2017 (for early hearing)

In view of the order passed in the writ petition, the application has become infructuous and disposed of as such.”

By the instant application, the applicant – petitioner however seeks to agitate the issues which were earlier agitated when the contempt petition came to be filed in April, 2017. In the event, the applicant – petitioner is having a fresh cause of action, he would be at liberty to agitate any of the issues on the fresh cause of action.

In view of the above, the application filed is considered to be misconceived and is rejected accordingly.

A. K. CHAWLA, J

JANUARY 23, 2020

acm