

\$~5

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

% Judgment delivered on: 11.12.2020
+ CONT.CAS(C) 786/2020
ANIL DUTT SHARMA Petitioner

versus

SHRI AMULYA PATNAYAK & ORS. Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner: Mr. Manoj Kumar Dwivedi, Advocate.

For the Respondent: Mr. Satyakam, ASC, GNCT with Inspector Sapna Duggal,
Vigilance Unit, Barakhamba Road.
ASI Mahinder Singh, PS ACB.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL.30504/2020 (exemption)

Exemption is allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CONT.CAS(C) 786/2020

1. The hearing was conducted through video conferencing.
2. Petitioner seeks initiation of contempt proceedings against respondents for failing to comply with order dated 18.02.2019.

3. By order dated 18.02.2019, respondents were directed to formally inform the petitioner as to their final findings in respect of the complaints made by the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the order itself records that the allegations made by the petitioner were investigated and inquiries have been held and complaints have already been filed. He submits that the respondents were directed to formally inform the petitioner as to their final findings in respect of the allegations. He submits that the final findings have already been provided and even the petitioner has annexed copy of letter dated 12.03.2019 as Annexure – P-3 which required the petitioner to get findings of the Vigilance inquiry from the office of the respondents.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that even yesterday a copy of the final findings have once again been communicated to the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that copy of the final findings, which have been provided do not respond to each and every complaint of the petitioner.

7. In my view, the purport of the order dated 18.02.2019 is only to provide the petitioner with the final findings in respect of the inquiries that have been held by the respondents and the complaints that have been filed, as recorded on 18.02.2019.

8. Order dated 18.02.2019 does not require the respondents to conduct any fresh inquiry and does not comment upon the inquiries already conducted and completed.

9. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that a separate reply to each and every allegation of the petitioner was required to be given to the petitioner is not borne out by the directions issued in order dated 18.02.2019.

10. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the final findings are insufficient or do not deal with each separate allegation does not arise for consideration in these proceedings. Since respondents have already admittedly provided the final findings to the petitioner, no ground is made out for initiating any proceedings under the Contempt Courts Act against the respondents.

11. Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

12. Copy of the judgment be uploaded on the High Court website and be also forwarded to learned counsels through email.

DECEMBER 11, 2020
st

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J