



\$~77

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 92/2025**

SAANVI MALU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Annie Mittal with Mr. Harshit
Dhamija, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Subhash Tanwar, CGSC for UOI
with Mr. Sandeep Mishra, Ms. Bhavi
Garg and Mr. Naveen, Advocates for
respondent No.1.
Mr. Abhinav Singh with Ms. Swega
Agarwal and Mr. Praveen Kumar
Kaushik, Advocates for GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

24.01.2025

%

1. The position is little unusual in the present case.
2. The petitioner had submitted an application for registration as a Citizen of India under Section 5(1)(f) of The Citizenship Act, 1955. Such application was filed before concerned District Magistrate within whose jurisdiction the applicant had claimed herself to be resident of and after according its due satisfaction, such Authority was required to transmit the same to Central Government.
3. The petitioner had earlier filed a writ petition i.e. W.P.(C) 7129/2024, which was disposed of by this Court on 17.05.2024 while directing GNCTD (respondent No.2 in the above said writ petition) to



decide the application of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of six weeks from the date of said order.

4. Since nothing was done by GNCTD, the petitioner was compelled to file another writ petition i.e. W.P.(C) 16083/2024. However, such writ petition was disposed of by another Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.11.2024, advising the petitioner to take recourse to appropriate remedy for implementing the order, while also observing that the remedy of contempt was always available with the petitioner.

5. In the above said backdrop, the present petition has been filed.

6. Besides GNCTD, Union of India has also been impleaded as contemnor No.1. However, It is quite apparent that the initial decision is to be taken by respondent No.2/GNCTD.

7. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/contemnor No.2 appears on advance notice and, on instructions, submits that the concerned Authority shall decide the representation within a period of four weeks from today.

8. It is quite obvious that there is apathy on the part of GNCTD and there is no adherence to the specific directions of this Court.

9. However, in view of the above said statement and assurance given by learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2, the petitioner, at the moment, does not press the present contempt petition.

10. It is expected that in view of the specific provisions of the above said Act and also in view of the specific directions given by this Court in initial order dated 17.05.2024, GNCTD would process the above said application and would do the needful, including



forwarding the requisite transmission to the Central Government after according its due satisfaction in this regard. Needless to say, the State Government would do the above within the above said time-frame of four weeks, as undertaken above. In case, nothing is done within the above said time, as undertaken today, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive the present contempt proceedings.

11. The petition stands disposed of as not pressed.

MANOJ JAIN, J

JANUARY 24, 2025
st