

\$~16

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 5888/2020**
KANISHK SINHATHE Petitioner
Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI Respondent
Through: Mr.Dhananjaya Mishra, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER

% **01.09.2020**

This petition has been heard through video conferencing.

This petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for the following reliefs:-

- “A. *A writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to rescind / cancel / withdraw the registrations granted in violation of the order of injunction dated: 17-06-2015 & 24-02-2020 passed G.A. No: 3378 of 2014 with C.S. No: 388 of 2014 in Title Suit No: 27 of 2018 by the Hon’ble High Court at Calcutta & Learned Additional District Judge, South 24-Parganas, 13th court at Alipore and return the money to the concerned applicants forthwith;*
- B. *A writ in the nature of certiorari calling for the entire records of the registrations granted in violation of the order of injunction dated: 17-06-2015 & 24-02-2020 passed G.A. No: 3378 of 2014 with S.S. No: 388 of 2014 in Title Suit No: 27 of 2018 by the Hon’ble High Court at Calcutta & Learned Additional District Judge, South 24-Parganas, 13th court at Alipore and on being so certified quash the impugned registrations granted and return the money to the concerned applicants*

forthwith.”

A reading of the above would show that the petitioner seeks enforcement of interim orders granted in Civil Suits filed by him. Clearly, the remedy of the petitioner would not be in form of a Writ Petition, but an appropriate application before the Trial Courts. Infact, on an earlier occasion also, the petitioner had filed a petition before this Court, being WP (C) 6144/2019 titled ***Kanishk Sinha & Anr. v. The State of NCT of Delhi & Ors.***, seeking similar relief. This Court had dismissed the same observing as under:-

“4. It is apparent from the above that the petitioners, essentially, seek enforcement of an order stated to have been passed by the Calcutta High Court. Clearly, the present petition is misconceived. This Court is not required to issue a writ of mandamus to enforce orders passed by the Calcutta High Court. The petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate remedies, if any, as available to the petitioner in the private law domain.

5. The petitioners claim for compensation also cannot be entertained in proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

6. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed. The pending application also stands disposed of.”

In view of the above, the present petition is clearly misconceived and is accordingly, dismissed. The petitioner shall be at liberty to take appropriate remedy, as may be available to the petitioner in accordance with law.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

SEPTEMBER 1, 2020/rv