



\$~27

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 71/2020**
VIRENDRA KUMAR YADAVPetitioner
Through: Mr. Vikram Hegde, Advocate
(Through VC)

versus

S.K VERMARespondent
Through: Mr. Rajesh Gogna, CGSC with Mr.
Mohd Bilal, Ms. Priya Singh, Ms.
Archana Roy and Mr. Nishant
Sharma, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

%

07.03.2025

CM APPL. 13850/2025(exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CM APPL. 13849/2025

1. Aforesaid application has been filed by respondent/Union of India.
2. Present contempt petition seeks initiation of contempt proceedings against respondent for wilful disobedience of the specific directions contained in judgment dated 10.12.2018 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P. (C) No. 13019/2018.
3. Admittedly, relief was given to the petitioner based on one previous judgment dated 22.03.2018, given by learned Single Judge of this Court in connected matters including W.P. (C) No. 3073/2017 *Ketan Vs. Union of India & Ors.*
4. Learned counsel for Union of India submits that the aforesaid main judgment rendered in *Ketan Vs. Union of India & Ors.* has been challenged by Union of India by filing SLP before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the

CONT.CAS(C) 71/2020

1



Hon'ble Supreme Court, while entertaining such SLP on 19.05.2020, has directed that there would be stay of operation of such order dated 22.03.2018 passed by the High Court of Delhi in W.P. (C) 3073-3084/2017.

5. In view of the above, Mr. Gogna, learned counsel for Union of India, submits that since the judgment, on the basis of which petitioner herein had been granted relief *vide* order dated 10.12.2018, has been stayed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, continuance of contempt proceedings would not be permissible and sustainable.

6. Learned counsel for respondent also refers to order dated 25.08.2023 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CONT. CAS (C) 62/2020, wherein also, in an identical situation, the contempt petition of similarly situated petitioner was disposed of while granting liberty to revival as per decision in SLP.

7. Learned counsel for petitioner appears on advance notice and joins the proceedings through *videoconferencing*. He, though, submits that order dated 10.12.2018 has not, so, far been challenged by Union of India but keeping in mind the aforesaid peculiar facts, petitioner does not press the present contempt petition at the moment. He, however, seeks liberty to revive the same as per the outcome of the aforesaid SLP.

8. The above application is, accordingly, allowed and, resultantly, the contempt petition is disposed of with liberty to petitioner to revive the same as per the outcome of the aforesaid SLP.

9. Next fixed date of 11.07.2025 stands cancelled.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MARCH 7, 2025/sw/pb

CONT.CAS(C) 71/2020

2