$~9

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

\+ CONT.CAS(C) 75/2026

MUNISH DABAS .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Parth Sahrawat, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES & ANR. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Vipul Agrawal, Sr. Standing Counsel along with Mr. Akshat Singh, Jr. Standing Counsel, Ms. Sakshi Sheriwal, Jr. Standing Counsel, Mr. Gooraang Ranjan and Ms. Harshita Kotru, Advocates for Revenue.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

<u>O R D E R</u>

% **02.02.2026**

1. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the directions contained in the order dated 18.03.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 1333/2025, read with the order dated 22.04.2025 passed in CM APPL.23019/2025 (seeking modification of the aforesaid order dated 18.03.2025), have been complied with, inasmuch as the respondents have issued the process for determining the reward payable to the petitioner, and on culmination of the said process, have issued a sanction order dated 30.12.2025 which reads as follows:

> *"F. No. PDIT (Inv.)-2/HQ/Reward/2025-26/670 Dated: 30 December, 2025*
>
> ***<u>SANCTION ORDER</u>***
>
> *By virtue of power vested in me vide CBDT guidelines for grant of Rewards to Informant, 2007 issued vide folio No. 292/2/1998-IT (Inv. III) dated 29.11.2007, I hereby Sanction the withdrawal of Rs. 14,00,000/-*

(Rupees Fourteen Lakh Only) in connection with the payment of Final Reward to the informant in the case of Jas Raj Maloo, PAN: AAKPM7107J (D.O.S.-18/01/2011). It is certified that all the conditions laid in the guidelines issued by the CBDT for payment of Final Reward are satisfied.

The expenditure involved shall be met out of grant under head "Other Revenue Expenditure" for Financial Year 2025-56.

(Krishna Kumar)
Pr. Director of Income Tax (Inv)-2
Delhi"

2. No further orders are required to be passed in the present contempt petition in view of the stand taken by the respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the sanctioned amount is deficient to a substantial extent and the petitioner is entitled to a much higher amount.

4. Needless to say, it would be open to the petitioner to agitate this aspect by initiating substantive proceedings.

5. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of with liberty to petitioner to file a substantive petition seeking to agitate its entitlement for a higher amount.

SACHIN DATTA, J

FEBRUARY 2, 2026/r