



\$~23

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 602/2024 and CM APPL.11995/2025**

**ALLIANCE POLYCHEM PVT LTD**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mr. Chinmaya Seth, Mr. A. K. Seth, Mr. Sumit Garg, Ms. Palak Mathur and Mr. Karanveer Singh, Advocates.

versus

**MAHIMA MADAN, SDM**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tushar Sannu, Advocate along with Ms. Pulak Gupta Joshi, Mr. Parveen Bansal, Advocates for GNCTD.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA**

**ORDER**

**13.02.2026**

%

1. The present petition alleges wilful disobedience of the directions contained in the judgment / order dated 11.09.2023 passed in W.P.(CRL) 2592/2023. The said order reads as under:-

**“W.P.(CRL) 2592/2023**

*3. The instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr.P.C.') has been filed on behalf of petitioner seeking issuance of writ or order in the nature of mandamus or any other writ directing the respondent to adjudicate the application dated 17.11.2022 pending before the Court of Sub-Judicial Magistrate, Hauz Khas, Tehsil Mehrauli, New Delhi in a time bound manner.*

*4. In view thereof, the petition stands disposed of with direction to the concerned authority to dispose of the application dated 17.11.2022 within two months under intimation to the petitioner.*

*5. The matter will be considered on its own merit not being influenced by this Court's direction regarding the entitlement and right of the applicant*



*concerned.*

*6. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.”*

2. It transpires that the main matter has been decided by the concerned Sub-Judicial Magistrate (Mehrauli) *vide* order dated 27.09.2025.

3. It transpires during the course of hearing that the petitioner’s application dated 17.11.2022, which sought impleadment in the very same proceedings, came to be decided only on 13.01.2026 *i.e.*, after the matter has already been disposed of by the Sub-Judicial Magistrate (Mehrauli).

4. According to the petitioner, the same is clearly incongruous and shows utter non-application of mind on the part of the concerned Sub-Judicial Magistrate (Mehrauli).

5. After some hearing, the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present petition and agitate the aforesaid aspects including assertions of his own rights in respect of the property in question, by way of substantive civil proceedings and / or by availing appropriate remedies under law. The petitioner is granted liberty to do so.

6. With the aforesaid liberty, the present petition is disposed of. Pending application also stands disposed of.

**SACHIN DATTA, J**

**FEBRUARY 13, 2026/r**