



\$~122

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 937/2024**

SURESH CHANDRA GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kamal Mehta, Adv.
(DHCLSC) for petitioner along
with petitioner in person.

versus

**OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
VIGILANCE**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Abhinav Singh, Adv.
Insp. K.P. Singh, Vigilance
Branch, Delhi Police.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

ORDER

23.10.2024

%

1. The petitioner is seeking initiation of the contempt proceedings against the respondent/Deputy Commissioner of Police (Vigilance), Delhi Police, alleging wilful disobedience of the directions of this Court dated 22.11.2018 as well as 08.02.2024 passed in W.P. (Crl.) No. 1157/2012 by this Court.

2. Having heard the learned counsels for the parties including the petitioner who is present in person and on perusal of the record, this Court finds that the present contempt petition is not worth its salt.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite the directions of this Court, he has not been supplied with the copy of the original contract entered into between him and the Director General, All India Radio ['AIR'] as well as the Director General of Supplies & Deliver



[‘DGS&D’], besides Consignee Receipts Certificates [‘CRC’], which documents were seized during the investigation in FIR no.148.1991 u/s 420, 467 & 471 of the IPC at the PS Tilak Marg, Delhi.

4. It may be pointed out that it is also the grievance of the petitioner that in Criminal Revision Petition No. 31/2012, an order was passed on 30.05.2023 to the following effect:-

“3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the FIR No. 148/1991 will be supplied to the petitioner appearing in person before the next date of hearing. As far as the other two documents are concerned, admittedly these two documents are with the petitioner in person as they were supplied before the learned Trial Court with the chargesheet. For the said reason the Court is not giving directions with regard to the same at this stage.”

5. First thing first, having regard to the fact that the petitioner has suffered the ignominy of a long criminal trial for 19 years in FIR No. 148/1991 under Section 420, 468 and 471 IPC registered on 13.03.1991 at PS Tilak Marg, Delhi, it is not fathomable that he was not supplied with a copy of the FIR. In so far as, the original contract executed between the petitioner and other two parties viz. AIR and DGS&D, besides CRC are concerned, a new plea is taken by the learned counsel for the petitioner, that the said documents were initially annexed with the chargesheet and after the conclusion of the trial, the said documents have surreptitiously been taken out from the Court record.

6. Again, in the absence of any complaint lodged with the learned District & Sessions Judge (HQ) and for that matter in the absence of any document evidencing that the petitioner ever applied for the certified copies of such documents from the Court or otherwise, such plea is not palatable. Mere bald assertions by the petitioner cannot be given any credence.



7. In view of the foregoing discussion, the petitioner is failing to lay down a foundation for entertaining or taking cognizance on the instant petition.

8. Hence, the present contempt petition is dismissed.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.

OCTOBER 23, 2024/sp/SA