



\$~61

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.APP.(C) 13/2023, CM APPLs. 13972/2023 & 13973/2023**
JAGMOHAN KAPOOR Appellant
Through: Mr. R K Tarun and Mr. Rohit Shukla,
Adv.

versus
MAMTA KAPOOR Respondent
Through: Ms. Manika Tripathy, SC with
Mr. Ashutosh Kaushik, Adv.
Ms. Sudershani Ray, Advocate

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **14.02.2024**

1. Yesterday, we raised an issue on the maintainability of the appeal because of the fact that the contempt petition was dismissed with cost of ₹25,000/- to be paid to the respondent.
2. In view of the position of law in the case of *D.N. Taneja v. Bhajan Lal*, (1988) 3 SCC 26 and *Midnapore Peoples' Coop. Bank Ltd. v. Chunilal Nanda*, (2006) 5 SCC 399, the present appeal is not maintainable under Section 19 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Liberty is with the appellant to seek such remedy as available in law.
3. The appeal is dismissed. No Cost.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

FEBRUARY 14, 2024/ds