



\$~64

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 345/2025 & CM APPL. 13466/2025**

DR O P SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Mr. Siddharth,
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Singh, Mr.
Shubhendu Saxena and Mr.
Anuvrat Singh, Advocates.

versus

PROF ASHOK KUMAR NAGAWAT & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr Shivendra Singh, Mr Bikram
Dwivedi, and Ms Prakriti Rastogi,
Advocate for R-1 to R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

06.03.2025

1. The petitioner has filed this contempt petition alleging non-compliance of an order dated 25.08.2021 in W.P.(C) 9017/2021.
2. The petitioner has filed the said writ petition against an order dated 13.08.2021, by which one Mr. Suneet Srivastava, who was arrayed as respondent No.3 in the writ petition, was appointed as Campus Director, Pusa Campus of the Delhi Skill and Entrepreneurship University ["DESU"] [Respondent No.1 in the writ petition]. By the aforesaid order, the Court noticed that Mr. Srivastava had not taken charge as Campus Director, and ordered that he shall not take over the said charge until the next date of hearing. I am informed that the said order is still subsisting, and the writ petition is next scheduled to be listed on 11.03.2025.

CONT.CAS(C) 345/2025

Page 1 of 3



3. In the meanwhile, the petitioner has filed this contempt petition in view of an order of DESU dated 27.02.2025, by which Dr. Pramod Kumar Goyal, who is arrayed as respondent No.5 in the contempt petition, has been appointed as the Campus Director.

4. The order dated 27.02.2025 has not been challenged by the petitioner in any substantive proceedings. The pending writ petition concerns an earlier order, by which Mr. Srivastava was appointed to the same post. The facts, as aforesaid, make it clear that Mr. Srivastava has neither been re-appointed as the Campus Director, nor has he taken charge.

5. Mr. Pankaj Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that Dr. Pramod Kumar Goyal's appointment is also illegal on the same ground as taken in the writ petition against the order appointing Mr. Srivastava. Even assuming the said contention to be correct, I am of the view that it cannot lay the foundation for proceedings in contempt.

6. Contempt proceedings are initiated for wilful and deliberate violations of the orders of this Court. In the present case, the order does not go so far as to suggest that no one can be appointed or take charge as Campus Director. The W.P.(C) 9017/2021 and the order dated 25.08.2021 are limited to the case of Mr. Srivastava alone. I do not consider it appropriate to institute contempt proceedings in these circumstances.

7. However, this is without prejudice to the right of the petitioner to assail the order dated 27.02.2025 in properly constituted proceedings as he may be advised, and to the rights of the respondents herein to defend the said proceedings in accordance with law.



8. The contempt petition, alongwith pending application, is disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 6, 2025

SS/kb/