

\$~15

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

% Judgment delivered on: 13.03.2020.

+ CONT.CAS(C) 225/2020 & CM APPL. 9591/2020

VIRENDRA SINGH

..... Petitioner

versus

SUDHIR HUDDA & ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner: Mr. K.K. Sharma, Mr. N.K. Sharma and Ms. Ishita Pandey, Advocates

For the Respondent: Mr. Anshuman and Mr. Chiranjeev Kumar, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner alleges contempt of order dated 13.03.2018 whereby petitioner was directed to report at the office of the IG Headquarters, Gandhinagar on or before 23.03.2018 so that he could be escorted to the Civil Hospital Ahmadabad. It was directed that only after getting a clearance from the specialist at the above hospital, petitioner would be asked to join his place of posting at Barmer.

2. Petitioner alleges that on 19.12.2019 a movement order has been issued, which directs the petitioner to proceed to Force

Headquarters, Hospital R.K. Puram, New Delhi in connection with self-treatment/check-up.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents who appears on advance notice submits that petitioner has not been posted or asked to join the place of posting at Barmer. He submits that the movement order requires the petitioner to proceed to Force headquarters hospital at R.K. Puram for his treatment and check-up. He submits that petitioner has been asked to report to Delhi so that he can get proper treatment for his ailment. He submits that there is no posting order or movement order issued by the respondent requiring petitioner to report to Barmer.

4. Record also shows that on 16.12.2019, the treating doctors at Gandhinagar had referred petitioner to Force Headquarters Hospital at R.K. Puram, New Delhi and for further management referred the petitioner to Vardhman Mahavir Medical College at Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi for sleep apnea.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the petitioner shall be provided appropriate medical treatment for his ailment.

6. In view of the above, no contempt is made out. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MARCH 13, 2020/‘rs’