



\$~84

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

% **Date of decision: 21st August, 2024**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1301/2024**

VIPIN KUMAR TYAGI

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. R.K.Shukla, Advocate.**

versus

NIDHI PANDEY

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr. S. Rajappa, Mr. Gowrishankar and Ms. G. Dhivyasri, Advocates.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.(ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondent for wilful disobedience of the directions of this Court dated 19.10.2023 passed in W.P. (C) 13896/2023.
2. Learned counsel for the respondent is present on advance notice.
3. Having heard the learned counsels for the parties, at the outset, the present contempt petition is a gross abuse of the process of law. Shorn of unnecessary details, the grievance of the petitioner is that his name has not been considered for National Teachers Award, 2023 by the respondent. This Court *vide* the aforesaid directions dated 19.10.2023 directed the respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 25.09.2023 on the subject within a period of two months.
4. It appears that in the interregnum, the petitioner filed another writ petition bearing W.P.(C) 11241/2024, wherein a similar grievance



has been raised by him, however, with regard to his name being recommended for the award to be made in the year 2024.

5. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the aforesaid writ petition *vide* order dated 13.08.2024 has already observed that the name of the petitioner was considered but he was not shortlisted, and therefore, there was no cause of action to file such petition. It would be expedient to reproduce the observations made by the Co-ordinate Bench in the order dated 13.08.2024, which go as under:

“3. In light of the above, since the Petitioner’s name has already been considered but not found to be in the shortlisted candidates, the Court finds no room to entertain the present petition. The conferment of awards, which are fundamentally discretionary recognitions bestowed by concerned authorities, do not equate to enforceable rights. Such awards are based on a selection process that evaluates myriad qualitative aspects as per norms. The Courts have invariably refrained from interfering in the discretionary and evaluative decisions of award committees unless there is a clear demonstration of mala fide, bias, or procedural anomaly that violates principles of natural justice. In the case at hand, the mere non-selection of the Petitioner, absent evidence of mala fide or deviation from established procedures, does not constitute a ground for judicial intervention. Moreover, the assertion that the Petitioner was not shortlisted due to his previous legal challenge lacks evidential support and is purely speculative. The claims of bias or discriminatory treatment have to be substantiated with concrete evidence which is absent in this case.”

6. In view of the above, since the representation of the petitioner has already been considered and rejected, there is no question of respondent being in wilful disobedience of the directions of this Court.

7. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is dismissed.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.

AUGUST 21, 2024

Sadiq