



\$~40

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 340/2024& CM APPL. 29932/2025**

SMERITY RANI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Himanshu Upadhyay & Mr.
Aman Jha, Advs.

versus

RAHUL NAVIN

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Spl. Counsel for
ED with Mr. Vivek Gurnani, Panel
Counsel, Mr. Kartik Sabharwal & Mr.
Harshat Singh, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

17.09.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Sections 10, 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, seeks the following prayers:-

“(i) Initiate contempt proceedings against the Contemnor and punish the contemnor in accordance with law and direct the contemnors to comply with the judgment dated 28.03.2023 of this Hon’ble Court in W.P.(Crl.) No. 2577/2021 titled ‘Vikas Verma vs. State (NCT of Delhi).

Pass any other or such order(s) as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the light of facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. By way of the present contempt petition, the petitioner alleged that directions by the learned Division Bench in W.P.(Crl.) 2577/2021 vide order dated 28.03.2023 were not being complied with. Relevant directions in the



aforesaid order are as under:-

“26. In addition to the above, the relationship between Respondent No. 5 / IPL and the LOCs i.e. Respondent Nos. 6 to 15 can be seen through the role of the statutory auditors as Directors and Key Managerial Persons in the aforesaid companies. Copy of the relevant extract from the MCA database showing that Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 to 15 are related parties through their auditors holding key managerial positions and being directors of the companies is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure P— 14 (Colly.)”

4. On a pointed query, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the latter was not a party to the aforesaid petition.
5. Response on behalf of the respondent has also been placed on record wherein similar preliminary objection has been taken with respect to the locus of the petitioner in filing the present petition. It is also stated in the status report that the petitioner is neither a home buyer and, therefore, is a stranger to the proceedings in which the aforesaid order was passed for which the compliance has been sought. In the aforesaid status report, the respondent has also given details with respect to the stage of the investigation in which the complaint has been filed before the court of competent jurisdiction.
6. Be that as it may, learned counsel for the petitioner at this stage does wish to press this petition.
7. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as not pressed.

AMIT SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2025/nk/yg