



\$~27

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 315/2024 & CM APPL. 21450/2024**

USHA SACHDEVA THROUGH

POA HOLDER AMIT SACHDEVA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhay Chitravanshi and Ms.
Poonam Dolo, Advocates.

versus

SHRI SUBHASISH PANDA IAS

VICE CHAIRMAN & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Prabhsahay Kaur, Standing
Counsel with Ms. Kamna Singh,
Panel counsel and Mr. Aditya Verma
and Ms. Kavya Shukla, Advocates for
DDA.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

08.10.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, seeks following prayers:-

“a) initiate contempt proceeding against the Contemnor/Respondent for willfully and deliberately disobeying the order dated 08.01.2024 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in CM APPL No. 1028 OF 2024 in WP(C) No. 12633 OF 2023 and for committing breach . of the statement given to the court.

b) Punish the Respondent under section 12 of the Contempt Act for committing Contempt of Court as per Contempt of Courts Act, 1971

c) Pass any other or further order/s as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. The present petition was filed alleging wilful disobedience of the orders dated 08.01.2024 and 25.09.2023, whereby the respondent DDA was directed



to pass a speaking order and communicate the same to the petitioner. It was further observed in order dated 25.09.2023 that in the event the petitioner is aggrieved with the order passed by the DDA, appropriate steps in accordance with law may be taken and all rights and contentions of the parties were left open in that regard.

4. Compliance affidavit has been filed on behalf of the DDA in which it is stated that the speaking order dated 05.03.2024 has been passed and the same has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the aforesaid speaking order has now been challenged in W.P.(C) 17417/2024 on the ground that the same was not a speaking order and the manner in which misuse charges were calculated, had not been proved. It is further submitted that in the aforesaid writ petition the said speaking order dated 05.03.2024 has since been stayed.

6. In view of the fact that the petitioner has already filed availed of his remedy with respect to alleged speaking order passed by the respondent, the present petition is disposed of with directions that the petitioner will be at liberty to take appropriate remedies in pursuance of the orders passed in the aforesaid writ petition.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 08, 2025/sn/db