



\$~16

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 876/2024**

PANKAJ PANDEY

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr N.K. Sahoo and Mr S.B. Sahoo,
Advocates.

versus

AMIT YADAV AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Sriharsha Peechara, Standing
Counsel with Mr Mananjay Mishra,
Ms Harshita Gupta, Mr Akshat
Kulshreshtha and Mr Shubham
Mishra, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

ORDER

24.05.2024

%

CM APPL. 31356/2024 (Exemption)

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 876/2024

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that appropriate proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 be initiated against the respondents for willful disobedience of the order dated 21.12.2023. It is the petitioner's contention that since he has been removed from the squatting site, the order dated 21.12.2023 is violated.
4. Mr Sahoo, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that since the order dated 21.12.2023 passed by this Court did not direct removal of the petitioner from his squatting site, his removal would amount to willful



disobedience of the said order.

5. It is seen that the order dated 21.12.2023 does not restrain the respondents from removing the petitioner from his squatting site. The only statement made on behalf of the respondents was that the vendors, who form a part of the list of 628 vendors (annexed with the petition), would be covered in the survey to be conducted. The respondents stand by the said statement.

6. In view of the above, we do not find merit in the contention that the order dated 21.12.2023 has been violated.

7. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

DHARMESH SHARMA, J

MAY 24, 2024
RK