



\$~59

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 360/2026**

ANKUR SARKAR AND ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Hetvi Patel & Mr.
Mohammad Tanvir Ali, Advs.

versus

NIKHIL KUMAR, IAS, CHIEF SECRETARY
(HEALTH)

.....Respondent

Through: None

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

09.03.2026

1. Through the present Petition, the Petitioners have sought initiation of contempt proceedings against the Respondent for disobedience of order dated 18.07.2025, passed in W.P.(C) 1300/2025.

2. The interim order dated 18.07.2025 reads as under:

"1. Issue notice.

2. Notice is accepted by Ms.Aliza Alam, the learned counsel for the respondents.

3. Let a counter affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed within a period of four weeks thereafter.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though the petitioners are still working with the respondents on a contractual basis, however, they are not being paid any salary for the same since January, 2025. The respondents shall look into this issue and if there is any salary dues owed to the petitioners, the same should be released to the petitioners within a period of four weeks from today.

5. List on 15th January, 2026."

3. Learned counsel representing the Petitioners complains that the directions in the aforesaid order have been deliberately and wilfully



disobeyed.

4. It is evident from reading of Para 4 of the order passed on 18.07.2025 that the Court had directed the Respondent to look into the issue and if it was found that there are any pending dues with respect to salary, to release the said dues to the Petitioners.

5. Pertinently, W.P.(C) 1300/2025 is still pending in this Court. In the opinion of this Court, the Petitioners, if so advised, may file an application to the same effect in the pending writ petition.

6. Invocation of jurisdiction under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is a serious issue and the same is to be exercised sparingly with caution.

7. In such circumstances, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke contempt jurisdiction at this stage, however, needless to say, the remedy as already noted can be availed by the Petitioners.

8. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MARCH 9, 2026

“SS”