



\$~68 & 59

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1520/2025**

X

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Shreya Munoth, Ms. Kritika
Bhardwaj and Ms. Sitamsini
Cherukumalli, Advocates.

versus

SAHITYA AKADEMI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Aggarwal, Advocate
for R-1.

Mr. Ashish K. Dixit, Mr. Umar
Hashmi, Ms. Iqra Sheikh and Mr.
Harshit Chitransh, Advocates for R-4.

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 976/2023**

X

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Shreya Munoth, Ms. Kritika
Bhardwaj and Ms. Sitamsini
Cherukumalli, Advocates.

versus

SAHITYA AKADEMI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Aggarwal, Advocate
for R-1.

Mr. Ashish K. Dixit, Mr. Umar
Hashmi, Ms. Iqra Sheikh and Mr.
Harshit Chitransh, Advocates for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

03.11.2025

%

1. These contempt petitions allege non-compliance of the judgment dated 28th August, 2025, passed by this Court.
2. The Akademi had initially applied for extension of time to comply



with the directions issued in the said judgment, which was declined on 26th September, 2025, in the following terms:

“CM APPL.61989/2025 (On B/O R-1 for Dir.)

1. This is an application filed by the respondent no.1/applicant seeking extension of time by six months to comply with directions contained in the judgment dated 28.08.2025 in the present petition.
2. It transpires during the course of the hearing that the applicant has also filed an LPA No. 602/2025 against the aforesaid judgment dated 28.08.2025, in which certain interim reliefs have also been sought by the applicants/respondent no. 1. As such, it is open for the applicant seeking interim orders/ extension of time, if any, from the concerned Court, which is seized of the said LPA No. 602/2025.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner/non-applicant informs that the request of the applicant/respondent no.1 for interim relief has been expressly denied by the Division Bench of this Court, when the same came up for hearing.
4. In the circumstances, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present application. The same is, consequently, dismissed.”

3. The Akademi has since preferred a Letters Patent Appeal, which is pending consideration before the Division Bench. There is no stay of the judgment dated 28th August, 2025, and the Division Bench has issued certain interim directions, which read as under:

“..XX.. ..XX.. ..XX..

LPA 602/2025 & CM APPL. 60722/2025 (Stay)

3. Issue notice to the respondents.
4. On behalf of respondent no.1 and 3, Mr. Sameer Vashisht, learned Standing Counsel has put in appearance and accepts notice, whereas on behalf of respondent no.2, Ms. Shreya Munoth, learned counsel has put in appearance and accepts notice and Mr. Ashish Dixit, learned counsel has put in appearance for respondent no.4 and accepts notice.
5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, we are of the opinion that the appeal requires hearing on several issues including (i) as to whether in the facts of the case, the Internal Complaints Committee (hereafter referred as ‘ICC’) was constituted in terms of Section 4 of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (hereafter referred as ‘the Act’) and further as to whether the ICC was constituted by the Competent Authority i.e. the ‘Employer’ and (ii) as to whether the



complaint of respondent no.2 could be taken cognizance of by the ICC or the Local Committee constituted under Section 6 of the Act.

6. As an interim measure, we provide that proceedings before the Local Committee shall go on as per law, however, recommendations which may be finally made by the Local Committee shall not be given effect to till the next date of listing.

7. List on 06.10.2025 to enable learned counsel for respondent no.2 to seek instructions as to where she can be posted. The appeal shall be listed for hearing on 13.11.2025.

8. We also require the appellant to file an additional affidavit bringing on record necessary documents to establish that ICC was constituted validly and by the Competent Authority.”

4. The appeal is now listed on 13th November, 2025, for further consideration. In the absence of any stay or direction to the contrary, the Akademi is required to comply with the directions issued by this Court.

5. In fact, counsel for the Akademi, Mr. Abhishek Aggarwal, submits that the monthly remuneration is being paid, which is also confirmed by the counsel for the Petitioner. The non-compliance pertains to arrears and other emoluments. For this, reconciliation of accounts is required. The parties shall accordingly exchange the requisite particulars for computation of arrears/emoluments. If the presence of the Petitioner is required for verification, the Akademi shall inform her in advance, specifying the particulars required and the date, time, and place for such verification.

6. As regards the grievance of non-registration of the Petitioner under the National Pension System (NPS) and non-deposit of monthly contributions, it is noted that this benefit is also extended to probationers. The Akademi is, therefore, directed to register the Petitioner under the NPS and commence monthly contributions in accordance with applicable rules.

7. The above directions shall remain subject to any further orders that may be passed by the Division Bench in the pending appeal.



8. The Court expects the Akademi to ensure due compliance with these directions and to avoid any situation that may necessitate recourse to coercive steps in future contempt proceedings.
9. The above directions be complied with within a period of ten days.
10. With the above directions, the Petitions are disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 3, 2025/hb/as