



\$~86

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 613/2025 CM APPL. 23744/2025**

MR. RAVIKASH PATEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ahmad Mishra, Ms. Vandita Jain,
Ms. Ayushi Rajput, Mr. Devansh
Pundir, Advs.

versus

MR. SHANKAR PANDIT & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu, Standing Counsel
for MCD with Mr. Sourav Verma Mr.
Shivam Singh and Mr. Sanjeev Kr.
Chawdhari, ASO and Mr. Bir Singh,
ASO.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

23.04.2025

1. This petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of order dated 24th March 2025, passed by the Court in WP(C) NO. 3634/2025.
2. The relevant directions passed by the Court are as under:

This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 30/04/2025 at 15:54:58



3. The limited relief sought by the petitioner in the present petition is that the MCD be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 18.02.2025 (reminder dated 04.03.2025), requesting extension of contract dated 10.06.2022 for a further period of 2 years after completion of initial 3 years period as provided in the E-Tender Notices bearing no. Co/Advtt/2021-2022/EDMC/NTT/D-365 dated 01.12.2021.

4. The said contract is in connection with display of advertisements through unipoles at various sites under the jurisdiction of the respondent. Mr. Tushar Sannu, standing counsel for the respondent fairly submits that the respondent shall consider the representation of the petitioner and decide

the same expeditiously under intimation to the respondent. Let the same be done within a period of 3 weeks from today.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner apprehends that prior to a decision on the representation, the respondents may proceed with issuance of a fresh tender in respect of same sites with regard to which contract has been entered into with the petitioner. In that eventuality, the petitioner shall be at liberty to avail appropriate remedies under law.

3. Mr. Tushar Sannu, Standing Counsel for MCD/respondent, has presented a decision dated 21st April 2025, on a representation of the petitioner; copy of which has been given to counsel for petitioner. The response may be filed on record of this Court by MCD.

4. Counsel for petitioner raises a vehement objection to the delay in deciding the representation considering that three weeks had been given by order dated 24th March 2025, and they had to approach this Court ultimately in the contempt petition in order to secure the response, which has now been issued, just a couple of days prior to this matter being listed today.

5. It is stated that counsel for MCD has not proceeded ahead with the issuance of fresh tender in respect of the same sites to which contract had been entered into with petitioner.

This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 30/04/2025 at 15:54:58



6. Contempt petition is disposed of with liberty to petitioner to seek remedies in accordance with law. Pending applications (if any) are rendered infructuous.

7. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

APRIL 23, 2025/RK/bp

This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 30/04/2025 at 15:54:58