$~75, 76 & 77

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

\+ CONT.CAS(C) 123/2025

SHANTANU AWASTHI .....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smiti Verma, Advocate.

versus

DAYA SHANKAR MADHWANI INCOME TAX OFFICER CIRCLE 67(1)-DELHI AND ANR .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Aggarwal, Sr. Standing Counsel with Mr. Shivansh Pandaya, Jr. Standing Counsel, Ms. Priya Sarkar, Jr. Standing Counsel, Mr. Viplav Acharya, Jr. Standing Counsel and Mr. Utkarsh Tiwari, Advocates.

Mr. Vinish Phoghat, Advocate for R-3.

Mr. Puneet Rai, Sr. Standing Counsel with Mr. Ashvini Kumar, Standing Counsel and Mr. Rishabh Nangia, Standing Counsel.

\+ CONT.CAS(C) 124/2025

ANKIT VIJ .....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smiti Verma, Advocate.

versus

DAYA SHANKAR MADHWANI INCOME TAX OFFICER, DELHI WARD 70-1, RANGE CODE 76 AND ORS. & ANR. .....Respondent

Through: Ms. Saumya Tandon, CGSC for R-3.

Mr. Puneet Rai, Sr. Standing Counsel with Mr. Ashvini Kumar, Standing Counsel and Mr. Rishabh Nangia, Standing Counsel.

\+ CONT.CAS(C) 140/2025

SIDDHARATH ARORA .....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smiti Verma, Advocate.

versus

DAYA SHANKAR MADHWANI INCOME TAX OFFICER, CIRCLE 70-1- DELHI & ANR .....Respondent

Through: Ms. Radhika B., CGSC along with Ms. Gurleen Kaur Waraich and Mr. Vivek Sharma, Advocates for R-2.
Mr. Puneet Rai, Sr. Standing Counsel with Mr. Ashvini Kumar, Standing Counsel and Mr. Rishabh Nangia, Standing Counsel.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

O R D E R

% **03.02.2025**

1. Ms. Smiti Verma, learned counsel for the petitioners, at the very outset, submits that as per the directions dated 08.05.2024 given by learned Division Bench of this Court, the demands with respect to TDS in questions have now been duly deleted from the portal.

2. The present contempt petitions have now been filed as nothing had been done, despite there being specific directions to the above said effect.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents appears on advance notice.

4. Ms. Smiti Verma, submits that as per the instructions, which she has now received from the petitioners, the needful has been done and the demand in question is no longer reflected on the portal.

5. She also states that though the needful should have been done much earlier but in view of above development, the petitioners are no longer desirous of pursuing with the present contempt petitions.

6. In view of the above, present contempt petitions are disposed of as not pressed.

MANOJ JAIN, J

FEBRUARY 3, 2025/ss