



\$~SB-2

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

+ W.P.(C) 17495/2025 & CM APPL. 3644/2026

MAHUA MOITRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Samudra Sarangi, Ms.
Navya Nanda, Ms. Panya
Gupta, Advs.

versus

LOKPAL OF INDIA THROUGH CHAIRPERSON AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ripudaman Bhardwaj, SPP
for CBI.
Mr. Nishant R. Katneshwarkar
and Mr. Vijay Singh, Advs. for
Applicant/Lokpal of India.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

ORDER

%

27.02.2026

CM APPL.13490/2026*[For modification of order dt. 23.01.2026]*

1. The present application has been filed by the Applicant/Respondent No.1 seeking modification of order dated 23.01.2026 passed by this Court, whereby CM APPL. 3644/2026 was disposed of.

2. It is contended that while disposing of the aforestated application, this Court has incorrectly recorded the following:

“CM APPL. 3644/2026 (Seeking extension of time)”

4. By way of the present application the Applicant/Respondent No.1 seeks extension of time to comply with the directions of this Court for passing an appropriate order in terms of the judgment dated 19.12.2025.



5. Learned counsel representing the non-applicant has no objection.

6. In view of the aforesaid, the period for disposal is extended by two months while observing that no request for further extension of time shall be entertained.

7. The present application stands disposed of.”

3. Today, learned counsel representing the Applicant contends that the aforestated recording of the facts is incorrect and seeks to draw support from the averments made in the application, particularly in paragraph no.3 thereof. Learned counsel further submits that the factual narration in the order dated 23.01.2026 does not conform to the averments and in view of the same, the relief as sought for would need to be re-granted.

4. This Court has perused the application and does not approve of the same.

5. The relief as sought by the Applicant in the previous round, and in which the orders were to be modified reads as under:

“a) Allow the present application for extension of time in terms of paragraph No.89 of the judgment dated 19.12.2025 delivered by this Hon’ble Court in Writ Petition (C) No. 17495/2025 by extending the time by two months;”

6. As is apparent, the only relief that was sought was for extension of time to accord its consideration for grant of sanction under Section 20 of the Lokpal Act, 2013. Paragraph No.89 of the judgment dated 19.12.2025, in respect of which the application came to be filed, reads as under:

“89. The learned Lokpal is requested to accord its consideration for grant of sanction under Section 20 of the Lokpal Act, strictly in accordance with provisions thereof as construed hereinabove, within a period of one month from today.”

7. Upon a combined reading of the relief sought and paragraph no.89 of the judgment as reproduced hereinabove, this Court does not



find itself inclined to entertain the pleas made by the Applicant by way of the present application.

8. In view of the aforesaid, the present application is dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.

FEBRUARY 27, 2026

jai/hr