



\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% ***Date of Decision: 18th December, 2024***+ **CONT.CAS(C) 64/2022**
M/S. SATGURU MEDICOS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.S.C.Singhal, Mr.Parth Mahajan
and Mr.Rachit Gupta, Advocates.

versus

SHRI SANDEEP KUMAR GAHLOT & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Appearance not given.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner seeks initiation of contempt against respondents for non-compliance of order dated 27.11.2019 passed in W.P.(C) No. 12510/2019.
2. By virtue of the above said order dated 27.11.2019, the respondents were directed to issue a *show cause* to the petitioner stating therein the details of various breaches and there was also a direction that the hearing be given to him.
3. While disposing of the above said writ petition, it was also directed that the respondents shall pass a reasoned order within three months.
4. The contempt has been filed because of the non-compliance of the above said specific directions.
5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the above said order has already been complied with and after giving a hearing to petitioner herein, a reasoned speaking order was passed on 18.10.2022.



6. It is also apprised that such order has even been challenged by the petitioner herein by filing a writ petition i.e. W.P.(C) No. 15948/2022 which is pending adjudication before the concerned Roster Bench on 05.02.2025.

7. While admitted the fact that order has been passed on 18.10.2022, the grievance of the petitioner is still to the effect that neither hearing was given to him nor such order has been passed within the time-frame given by the Court.

8. This Court is conscious of the fact that by virtue of the present petition, petitioner seeks initiation of contempt proceedings.

9. Needless to say, the aspect of punishing anyone for the purposes of committing any contempt comes into play once it is shown, in a definite manner, that there was a wilful breach and defiance on the part of the contemnor concerned.

10. Undoubtedly, there is some delay in disposal of the matter but, merely, because of the fact that the decision was not taken within the given time-frame would not, *ipso facto*, persuade this Court to invoke its contempt jurisdiction.

11. Moreover, as already noticed above, the above said order has already been challenged by the petitioner by filing a substantive writ petition.

12. In view of the above, and the fact that decision has already been taken, *albeit*, belatedly, this Court does not deem it necessary to take any further action in the present contempt petition.

13. The contempt petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

DECEMBER 18, 2024/sw