



\$~103

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1519/2025**

**NI-MET METALS INC THROUGH
SPA IKRAM KHAN**

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Chirag Aneja and Mr. Suraj Singh
Chauhan, Advs.**

versus

**DIRECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN
TRADE AND ANR**

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. R.B. Dubey, CGSC with Ms.
Aprajita Verma, Mr. Vivek Sharma
and Ms. G. Kaur Wariah, Advs.**

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA**

**ORDER
10.10.2025**

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CM APPL. 63848/2025 (exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Application is disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 1519/2025

3. The present petition under Section 2(b) read with Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 seeks following prayers:-

- “a) Initiate contempt proceedings against the Respondents, especially concerned DGFT officials, for deliberate and wilful disobedience of orders dated 23.12.2024 passed in W.P. (C) 17801/2024.
- b) Direct the Respondents to forthwith issue the Public Notice operationalizing Petitioner's renewal and allotting Area of Operation in strict compliance with 27th IMC MOM dated 25.06.2025;
- c) Pass coercive directions/penalties as deemed appropriate to uphold the dignity of this Hon'ble Court;



d) Pass such further orders as may be deemed just and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

4. This is the third contempt petition filed on behalf of the petitioner. The previous petitions were disposed of *vide* order dated 19.03.2025 in CONT.CAS(C) 414/2025 and order dated 30.04.2025 in CONT.CAS(C) 653/2025.

5. *Vide* order dated 30.04.2025, while disposing of the second contempt petition bearing no. CONT.CAS(C) 653/2025, the learned Predecessor Bench of this Court passed the following order:-

“3. Respondent’s counsel states that, as already been mentioned in the earlier contempt petitions, which have been filed earlier, the Inter-Ministerial Committee (‘IMC’) is the all-empowered/competent committee to take a decision on petitioner’s application, and the IMC is likely to convene its next meeting sometime in May-June 2025.

4. In this view of the matter, the Court is of the opinion that the petitioner would have to await the decision of the IMC and, in the meantime, documents, as requested by the respondent, may be provided.

xxx

xxx

xxx

8. This petition is, therefore, disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to get the same revived in case the decision in compliance of order dated 23rd December 2024, is not taken by the IMC.”

6. It is pointed out that the decision by the IMC has been taken, by approving the renewal application of the petitioner.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the aforesaid decision has not been implemented in its spirit.

8. It is pertinent to note that the directions passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.(C) 17801 of 2024 *vide* order dated 23.12.2024 was to the following effect:

“8. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with a



direction that the Respondents shall take a decision on the Petitioner's renewal application bearing file no. HQRPSIAAPPLY00000425AM24, positively within a period of four weeks from today."

9. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the aforesaid direction has been complied. If the petitioner's grievance persist with respect to the effective implementation of the decision taken by the IMC, he can avail of his remedies in accordance with law before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

10. The petition is dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

11. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 10, 2025/mj/sg