



\$~66

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1583/2025**

CH B N CHOWDARY

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person, through Vc.
versus

MR JAGDISH CHANDRA, CGSC & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashish K. Dixit, CGSC with Mr.
Umar Hashmi, Ms. Iqra Sheikh, Advs.
for UOI.
Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Mr. Shailendra
Sharma, Mr. Manish Kumar Singh,
Mr. Vasu Agarwal, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

27.10.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Article 215 of the Constitution of India read with Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 seeks the following prayers: -

“a) Initiate the contempt proceeding against the respondents and contemnor for wilful disobedience of judgement and order of Review Pet.342/2025 dated 30.05.2025 in W.P.(C) 5240/2025;
b) Direct the respondents to comply with the direction to compensate or pass any order punishing the respondent or contemnor for Contempt of Court;
c) Pass any orders or directions as maybe deem fit and proper in the facts of the case in the interests of justice to secure the ends of justice.”

3. W.P.(C) 5240/2025 filed by the petitioner was dismissed by the learned Division Bench of this Court *vide* order 24.04.2025 by observing as under: -



“2. The petitioner had approached the learned Central Administrative Tribunal (PB), New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as ‘Tribunal’) by way of Original Application No. 1054/2025 (O.A.), seeking the following reliefs:

“8.1 To direct the respondents to release the full pay and allowances, granting the increments on due dates from 1st January, 2025 to 1st March, 2025.

8.2 To pass any other order as may be deemed fit by this Hon’ble Tribunal.”

3. The learned Tribunal found that, leave alone the petitioner not being a member of any Government service, he had at best appeared to be an IAS aspirant who had undergone coaching and training at an Institute, and thus had no *locus standi* to claim any such relief from the Court. The learned Tribunal, therefore, found that the O.A. was not maintainable before it.

4. We find that the contents of the present petition are completely vague and do not help us understand the grievance of the petitioner.

5. We, therefore, are constrained to dismiss the same as being devoid of any merit.”

4. Subsequently, the petitioner preferred a Review Petition bearing no. 342/2025, which was also dismissed by the learned Division Bench of this Court *vide* order dated 30.05.2025.

5. The aforesaid order was challenged by the petitioner before the Hon’ble Supreme Court in SLP bearing no. 18031-32/2025, which was dismissed *vide* order dated 08.09.2025.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents appearing on advance notice submits that the latter are practicing advocates appointed as panel lawyers.

7. Petitioner who appears in-person through video conferencing was put a pointed query as to the alleged disobedience for which the present petition has been filed, however he is not able to answer the same.

8. A perusal of the aforesaid orders would reflect that there were no directions to the respondents or to the department for any compliance.



9. In these circumstances, the present petition is dismissed and disposed of.
10. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 27, 2025/kr/sg