



\$~57

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

Date of decision: 10.12.2025

+ W.P.(C) 18771/2025
RAKESH KUMAR GUPTA (VISUALLY IMPAIRED)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pulkit Prakash, Mr. Arjun
Mohan, Mr. Aarsh Raj, Ms.
Arushi Sharma, Ms. Sriti
Kashyap, Ms. Ankita Sinha,
Advs.
In-person.

versus

DHARMENDRA, CHIEF SECRETARY, G.N.C.T.D

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sujeet Kumar Mishra
and Mr. Harsh Kumar Pandey
Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPLs. 78142-43/2025 (Exemptions)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 18771/2025

2. This petition has been filed, challenging the Order dated 25.02.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal')



in M.A. No. 875/2025 and in C.P. No. 53/2025 arising out of O.A. No. 3770/2024, titled ***Rakesh Kumar Gupta (visually impaired) v. Shri Dharmendra (Chief Secretary Delhi)***, whereby, the contempt petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed, while reserving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the Order dated 07.02.2025 passed by the respondent, in case he is aggrieved of the same.

3. The contempt proceedings arose from an allegation of non-compliance with the Order dated 07.11.2024 passed by the learned Tribunal in O.A. No. 3770/2024, whereby, while allowing the petitioner to withdraw the O.A. with liberty to file a representation before the respondent in respect of his grievances, the learned Tribunal had directed the respondent no. 1 to decide the same as expeditiously as possible and, in any case, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of such representation. Complaining that the representation so filed had not been decided, the petitioner thereafter filed the contempt petition.

4. The respondent, however, passed an Order dated 07.02.2025, rejecting the representation of the petitioner. As the representation had been considered, though rejected, the learned Tribunal, in our view, rightly held that the contempt deserves to be closed, while at the same time, reserving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the Order dated 07.02.2025, in case he is aggrieved of the same.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner, as well as the petitioner, who appears virtually before us, submits that in paragraph 1 of the Impugned Order, the learned Tribunal has also recorded, as under:

“Mr. Anuj Kumar Sharma, learned counsel for



*the respondent, at the outset, submits that the order dated 07.11.2024 passed in OA No. 3770/2024 has been complied with inasmuch as the applicant's representation dated 21.11.2024 is disposed of. In support of his submissions, he placed on record an order dated 07.02.2025 passed by the Deputy Director (Vigilance), Govt. of NCT of Delhi, Directorate of Vigilance. **'This order is not disputed by the applicant appearing in person.'***

(emphasis supplied)

6. They submit that this sentence may be read as a concession by the petitioner that the Order dated 07.02.2025 has been rightly passed by the respondent. In our view, this is not the import of the said sentence. The learned Tribunal is merely recording that the fact that the Order dated 07.02.2025 has been passed by the respondent is not disputed by the petitioner. In fact, as noted hereinabove, the learned Tribunal has reserved liberty to the petitioner to challenge the Order dated 07.02.2025 in accordance with law.

7. The second grievance of the petitioner is that the Impugned Order also disposes of M.A. No. 875/2025, which had been filed by the petitioner along with the contempt petition. By the said application, the petitioner had sought a direction against the respondent to produce the relevant documents with detailed explanations, relevant information and necessary clarifications. The petitioner submits that, with the disposal of this application, he may suffer prejudice when he challenges the Order dated 07.02.2025 before the appropriate forum.

8. We find that even this apprehension of the petitioner is totally



2025:DHC:11297-DB



unfounded. In case the petitioner challenges the Order dated 07.02.2025, he can do so in accordance with law, on all grounds, and seek all reliefs as are maintainable in law.

9. In view of the above, we find no merit in the present petition. The same is accordingly dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MADHU JAIN, J

DECEMBER 10, 2025/prg/RM/SS