



\$~15

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1137/2025**

SUDAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Narendra Sharma and Mr. Vakul
Sharad, Advocates.

versus

ANITA YADAV

.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

20.08.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Sections 10/12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 seeks the following prayers:-

“a) issue show cause notice/summon to the Respondent/Contemnor calling upon him/her/them to show cause as to why contempt proceedings may not be initiated against the respondent as the respondent/contemnor failed to comply the order dated 21.4.25 passed in w. P. (civil) no. 5001/2025 titled as Sudan and ors. Vs Govt. of NC'T of Delhi and punish the respondents for committing contempt of court as they willfully violated the same;

Pass such other or further orders or directions as deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the present case.”

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that *vide* order dated 21.04.2025 in W.P.(C) 5001/2025, learned Single Judge had passed the following order:-

“1. The petitioner had filed an application dated 10.07.2023 before the Revenue Assistant, Tehsil Saket, against an order dated 20.02.2003 passed by the Revenue Assistant, Hauz Khas. He has approached this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution seeking expeditious disposal



of proceedings pending before the Sub Divisional Magistrate.

2. Mr. Manish Batra, learned counsel for the Government of NCT of Delhi [“GNCTD”], who appears on advance notice, states that the concerned village has been urbanised, as a result of which the proceedings remains pending before the SDM. However, he states that the proceedings will be disposed of one way or the other, within eight weeks from today.

3. As no other relief is sought in the writ petition, the writ petition is disposed of in terms of submission made on behalf of learned counsel for GNCTD.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the proceedings has not been concluded by the SDM within a period of 8 weeks, as directed *vide* the aforesaid order, the present contempt petition has been filed.

5. In the considered opinion of this Court, the concerned SDM is performing a *quasi-judicial* function while conducting the proceedings before it in an application filed by the petitioner under Appendix VI Rules 14 of the DLR Act and Order IX Rule 13 of the CPC.

6. If the petitioner has any grievance that the said proceedings could not be completed within a period of 8 weeks, he has an alternate efficacious remedy, which he can take recourse to in accordance with law before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

7. This Court finds that the present petition is not maintainable and therefore, the same is dismissed and disposed of.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

AUGUST 20, 2025/sn