



\$~63

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

% **Date of decision: 10th September, 2024**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1439/2024**

RAMINDER SINGH & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anibhav Ramakrishna, Ms.
Anjali Chauhan, Mr. Harshit
Pandey, Advs.

versus

SURENDER PAL SINGH & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajat Wadhwa, Mr.
Gurpreet Singh and Ms. Divya
Kanwar, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHARMESH SHARMA

DHARMESH SHARMA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner No. 1/son along with his wife petitioner No. 2 seek initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents No. 1 & 2, viz. his parents and in-laws of his wife, for the alleged wilful disobedience of the directions of this Court dated 06.02.2023.
2. Respondent No. 1 is present along with his counsel on advance notice.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a long pending dispute between the parties had been settled by way of the aforesaid order in W.P.(C) 3025/2021, wherein *inter alia* respondent No. 1 had agreed as under: -

“iii. The father has also agreed that if his son and his family, treat him and his wife in a proper manner and do not resort to ill-treatment, the father would be willing to agree for a substantial share (1/3rd) of his assets to go to the son and his family. However,



the same shall be fully dependent on the treatment meted out by the son's family to the parents.”

4. It is submitted that although the petitioners have been very respectful towards the respondents and have been treating them well, respondent No. 1/father is not agreeable to part with 1/3rd of his shares in the assets.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents has urged that the present contempt petition is without any cause of action since there is no case of willful disobedience inasmuch as there was never any unconditional assurance that any share in the property would be given to the petitioners.

6. At the outset, this contempt petition is misconceived and ill-conceived as this Court in contempt jurisdiction cannot go into the issues as to whether or not the conduct of the petitioners towards the respondents has been humane, cordial and respectful, particularly when respondent no. 1 on being asked that they are still being tormented in a variety of ways.

7. It is obvious that when there are old and deep scars due disputes between the parties whatever be the reasons, some more time is required to heal such wounds.

8. The present contempt petition is dismissed.

DHARMESH SHARMA, J.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2024

sa