



\$~120

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1193/2025**

SHRI VED PRAKASH

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Pallavi Parmar, Adv.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF RESETTLEMENT AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Radhika Bishwajit Dubey, CGSC
with Ms. Gurleen Kaur, Mr. Vivek
Sharma, Ms. Awajita Verma, Adv.
with Mr. Abhishek J. DGR.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

07.08.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Section 10, 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 seeks the following prayers:-

“a. Allow the instant Petition taking cognizance of this act of Contempt by the Respondent no.1 through the Officer-in-charge as named and Respondent no. 2 through its Director as named in the memo of Parties; and; b. Initiate proper proceedings against the Respondents and punish them accordingly in terms of the provisions of the Contempt of Courts act for showing contumacious conduct with respect to the Impugned Order dated 9th May 2025 by not disposing off CM No. 23533/2025 in WP (C) no. 12422/2024 while treating it to be a representation and the subsequent Representation dated 14th May 2025 sent by the Petitioner; and

Pass any other further order/s which this Hon'ble Court may



deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case and in interest of justice.”

3. Vide order dated 09.05.2025 in W.P (C) 12422/2024 the following directions were passed:-

“3. In compliance of the order dated 07.05.2025, the competent person, i.e., Col. Navneet Dahia, Director (Self Employment), DGR, is present in Court today. Ms. Dubey, learned CGSC for UOI, upon instructions from Col. Navneet Dahia, states that without prejudice, the petitioner’s representation pertaining to non-release of payment under the ESM Scheme would be considered by the DGR and a Board of Officers would be constituted for the said purpose and an opportunity of hearing would also be granted.”

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent on advance notice submits that the aforesaid representation has since been decided *vide* Diary No. 5555498/2025. The decision has been passed, copy of the same has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the decision has not been taken with respect to the issues raised by the petitioner.

6. Be that as it may, so far as the present petition was concerned, the direction was to decide the representation. If the petitioner is not satisfied with the outcome of the order, the petitioner may avail of the legal remedies available in accordance with law.

7. In view of the above, the petition is disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

AUGUST 7, 2025/nk/sp