



\$~113

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9428/2025 & CM APPL. 64656/2025**

POONAM CHANDEL SINHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Puneet Mittal, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rupendra Pratap Singh and Ms. Sakshi
Mendiratta, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & OTHERS.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Katyal, Standing Counsel
with Ms. Ritika Bansal, Advocate for R1.
Mr. Prosenjeet Banerjee, Ms. Rea Bhalla, Ms.
Divita Vyas and Ms. Anushka Sharma, Advocates
for R5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

16.10.2025

1. Today CM APPL. 64656/2025 filed by the petitioner is listed wherein prayer has been made to stay the impugned order.
2. However, with the consent of learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties, the main writ petition itself is taken up today for consideration.
3. The writ petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing the impugned order dated 20.06.2025 whereby the competent authority of respondent/DDA has suspended petitioner's dependant membership of Siri Fort Sports Complex for a period of six months commencing from the date



of the said order.

4. Mr. Puneet Mittal, learned Sr. Counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner invites attention of the Court to the report of the Disciplinary Committee to contend that the meeting of the disciplinary committee had taken place on 31.05.2025 and in the said meeting, recommendation has been made by the disciplinary committee for suspending petitioner's dependant membership for a period of four months. However, the competent authority, which has not been disclosed in the impugned order, has passed an order suspending the petitioner's dependant membership for a period of six months contrary to the recommendations made by the disciplinary committee.

5. He further refers to the date on the report of the disciplinary committee to contend that same was generated on 10.07.2025, whereas the impugned order is dated 20.06.2025, which shows that the minutes of the meeting have been created after the impugned order was passed to justify the action taken against the petitioner.

6. Further, referring to the counter-affidavit filed by the respondent/DDA, he contends that various documents have been referred to, which were allegedly provided to the petitioner, but no such documents were ever given to petitioner, nor any opportunity of hearing was granted to petitioner before passing the impugned order.

7. He submits that two-member committee was constituted, but the same was not constituted in terms of the minutes of 29th meeting of Sports Management Board which provides that it is the Member (Finance) who will nominate two members. Referring to the notice dated 20.06.2025 (Annexure-6), he submits that the said notice does not suggest that the two



members of the committee have been nominated by the Member (Finance) of the DDA.

8. *Per contra*, Mr. Sanjay Katyal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent/DDA invites attention of the Court to the apology given by petitioner on 23.05.2025 [date incorrectly mentioned as 22.05.2025] to contend that in the said apology, the petitioner has clearly admitted about the incident and has shown remorse, therefore, petitioner cannot feign ignorance about the incident or the contents of the complaint. He further contends that all procedural norms were followed.

9. Mr. Prosenjeet Banerjee, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no. 5 submits that the apology clearly shows two things, viz., - (i) that the incident did happen, and (ii) the petitioner was regretful about the incident. Therefore, the principles of natural justice stood complied with.

10. Having heard the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that originally the disciplinary committee had recommended the suspension of petitioner's dependent membership for a period of four months, however, *vide* impugned order the competent authority has enhanced the punishment to six months.

11. Without going into the merits of the respective contentions of the parties, and in the peculiar facts of this case, since – (i) the period of four months after the passing of impugned order has already elapsed, and (ii) petitioner has already tendered an apology, the remaining suspension of two months is set aside. Consequently, the respondent DDA is directed to restore the petitioner's dependent membership of Siri Fort Sports Complex, with immediate effect.

12. The petition along with pending application, is disposed of in the



above terms.

13. The date already fixed i.e. 07.11.2025 stands cancelled.

OCTOBER 16, 2025/jg

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J