



\$~84

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 1506/2026 & CM APPL. 7376/2026, CM APPL. 7377/2026

RAM KRISHAN VED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar, Mr. Gaurav Mehta and Ms. Rekha Bhardwaj, Advocates.

versus

DELHI JAL BOARD (HQ)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu and Mr. Fajallu Rehman, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **03.02.2026**

1. The Petitioner assails the correctness of the order passed on 15.09.2025 passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, (hereinafter referred to as '**Tribunal**') in C.P. No. 527/2025 in O.A. No. 2837/2021 *vide* which the contempt petition filed by the Petitioner was closed.

2. The Petitioner filed O.A. which was disposed of on 20.03.2025, while directing the Respondent/Competent Authority to decide the Petitioner's representation. Admittedly, the Petitioner's representation was decided and disposed of *vide* order dated 08.08.2025.

3. Thus, considering that an affidavit of compliance had been filed on 14.08.2025 by the Respondent/Authorities stating that the representation has been decided and the same was not disputed by the learned counsel representing the Petitioner, the learned Tribunal closed the contempt petition *vide* the impugned order.

4. Now, aggrieved by the disposal of the contempt petition, the present writ has been filed.

5. The learned counsel representing the Petitioner submits that the



order dated 08.08.2025, is not a speaking order and thus, amounts to contempt of the directions passed *vide* order dated 20.03.2025 by the learned Tribunal in the O.A.

6. The jurisdiction under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, can be invoked only in rare and exceptional cases and it cannot be carried out in a routine or casual manner or to execute a decree or implement an order. The object of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is to punish the contemnor and maintenance of the sanctity of judicial process as well as protection of public interest.

7. It is settled that contempt proceedings should be invoked only if it is established that there was a wilful disobedience of a judicial order by a contemnor. Once the directions passed by the learned Tribunal had been complied with and it is not disputed that the representation of the Petition has been decided *vide* order dated 08.08.2025, the contempt proceedings could not have survived. Hence, this Court finds no error or infirmity in the impugned order passed by the learned Tribunal and the same warrants no interference.

8. The grievance of the Petitioner that the order dated 08.08.2025, passed by the Competent Authority, is not a speaking order and the correctness of the same, can be ascertained by filing a fresh O.A before the appropriate forum. The liberty to that extent was also granted by the Tribunal.

9. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

FEBRUARY 3, 2026/du