



\$~1

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1575/2024**

ANITA GUPTA SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Puneet Mittal, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Rajeev Kumar Sharma, Mr.
Dharam Vir, Mr. Rahul Gupta, Mr. R.
P. Singh and Mr. Sameer Vatts,
Advocates with Petitioner in person.

versus

CHAMBER ALLOTMENT COMMITTEE AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

Through: Dr. N. Pradeep Sharma, Mr.
Devender Kumar, Mr. Naresh Kumar,
Ms. Vidhi Gupta and Ms. Kiran
Sharma, Advocates for R-4 with R-4
in person.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Passey, R-5 in
person.
Mr. Satyakam, ASC with Mr. Harsh
Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

14.10.2024

%

1. The present petition alleges contempt of order dated 9th September, 2024 in W.P.(C) 12611/2024 wherein this Court had directed to maintain *status quo* concerning the possession of Chamber No. 103 to Respondents No. 4 and 5.
2. Counsel for the Petitioner submits that, as of the date of the order in

CONT.CAS(C) 1575/2024

Page 1 of 2



question, Respondents No. 4 and 5 were not in possession of Chamber No. 103. However, they are now actively seeking to take possession of the chamber, which constitutes a violation of the Court's direction to maintain *status quo*. To substantiate this claim, reliance is placed on photographs annexed to the petition, allegedly showing Respondent No. 4 attempting to take possession of the chamber in question.

3. In response, Mr. Satyakam, ASC, apprises the Court of the letter dated 31st August, 2024 issued by the Office of Principal District and Sessions Judge (South General Branch), District Courts, Saket whereby the 2nd slot of Chamber No. 103 was duly allotted to Mr. Jitender Singh, Advocate. A copy of the said communication is handed over across the Board and taken on record.

4. Upon careful consideration of the facts, and in light of the aforementioned communication, it is evident that possession of Chamber No. 103 has already been handed over to Mr. Singh. Furthermore, the Petitioner's plea for setting aside the allotment of Chamber No. 103 to Respondents No. 4 and 5 was declined by a separate order passed today in W.P.(C) 12611/2024. Accordingly, in the opinion of the Court, the Petitioner no grounds for contempt have been established by the Petitioner.

5. In light of the above, the present petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2024

ab