



\$~29, 30

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1790/2024, CM APPL. 66192/2024**

DHEERAJ GUPTA AND ANR

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Nancy Thapar and
Mr. Sudhanshu Sikka, Advocates.

versus

MEGHA CHHABRA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Kunal, Mr. Jatin, Ms. Bhavya
Aggarwal and Ms. Neelakshi Sharma,
Advocates.

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 199/2025**

MEGHA CHHABRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kunal, Mr. Jatin, Ms. Bhavya
Aggarwal and Ms. Neelakshi Sharma,
Advocates.

versus

DHEERAJ GUPTA

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Nancy Thapar and
Mr. Sudhanshu Sikka, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

29.07.2025

%

1. This common order shall dispose of the above-captioned contempt petitions filed by both parties, each alleging that the other has wilfully violated and committed contempt of this Court's order dated 19th September,



2024, passed in W.P. (CRL) 3155/2023.

2. Considering the nature of allegations, it is considered apposite to reproduce the entire order, which reads as follows:

“1. *Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Bank Lockers of the petitioners have been seized pursuant to the Order dated 02.01.2023 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Central, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi, on the pretext that the jewellery articles of the complainant are lying in the Bank Lockers. The Bank Lockers are lying seized.*

2. *After some talks, the parties have agreed as under: -*

(i) That Shri Dheeraj Gupta, the husband of the complainant-respondent No. 4, who is present in the Court, shall relinquish his share in Property bearing No. F-305, Second Floor, Sushant Lok II, Sector 57, Gurugram, Haryana in favour of the complainant-respondent No. 4,

(ii) That Shri Dheeraj Gupta shall sign the documents for the passport of child,

(iii) That Shri Dheeraj Gupta shall have a right to visit the child when he visits to U.S.A.,

(iv) That Shri Dheeraj shall also be given access to the child through telephone.

3. *The parties seek time to draw a formal Agreement and also to file the Mutual Divorce Petition before the Trial Court.*

4. *List for consideration on 05.11.2024.”*

3. The Court has heard counsel for both parties. While each side accuses the other of breaching the recorded terms, their submissions ultimately rest on divergent interpretations and alleged non-compliance of what was broadly agreed upon during the hearing on 19th September, 2024.

4. However, this Court finds no ground to invoke contempt jurisdiction. The order dated 19th September, 2024 does not embody any specific undertakings tendered to the Court, nor does it issue binding directions. Rather, it is in the nature of a consensual recording of terms discussed *inter se* the parties, with liberty afforded to formalise the same through a written agreement and initiate appropriate matrimonial proceedings. The order is facilitative, and cannot be interpreted as Court’s directive. A breach of such



mutual understanding, even if assumed, may give rise to civil consequences or remedy in matrimonial or contractual proceedings but cannot *per se* attract contempt jurisdiction under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

5. Consequently, both contempt petitions are dismissed. This, however, shall not preclude either party from seeking appropriate relief before the competent forum for any alleged non-compliance with the agreed terms, in accordance with law. All rights and contentions of the parties in that regard are left open.

6. Disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JULY 29, 2025

nk