



\$~44

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 973/2026**
M/S SAWASDEE RETAILS PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pankaj Seth, Mr. Nishant Menon,
Ms. Radhalakshmi R, Mr Amit Goel,
Mr Shakil Ahmed, Advocates.

versus

JITENDER YADAV & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mrs Avnish Ahlawat SC DTC, Mr
Nitesh Kumar Singh, Ms Aliza Alam,
Mr Mohnish Sehrawat, Advocates for
DTC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

26.05.2026

1. In paragraph no. 13 of the application, the following disobedience has been alleged against the proposed contemnor.

“13. During the pendency of the present Writ Petition and while the aforesaid restraint orders were admittedly in force, the Petitioner was taken by complete surprise upon discovering that, on 11.05.2026, an amount of Rs. 4,50,00,000/(Rupees Four Crore Fifty Lakhs Only) had been credited to its ICICI Bank account through RTGS from an account described as 'DELHI TRANSPORT CORPORATION - 91261010000076 - CNRB0019126'. The said amount was credited unilaterally and without any prior intimation, notice, or communication from the Respondents. The transfer was effected without the knowledge, consent, concurrence, or



acquiescence of the Petitioner, and without any disclosure as to the nature, purpose, characterization, or legal basis of the remittance. The unilateral remittance, effected during the currency of the restraint orders and dehors any liberty granted by this Hon'ble Court, raises serious concerns regarding the propriety and legality of the Respondents' conduct. It is further pertinent to note that DTC filed its Counter Affidavit only on 14.05.2026, i.e., after the aforesaid amount had already been credited to the Petitioner's account. A copy of the transaction details evidencing the RTGS credit dated 11.05.2026 is annexed herewith and marked as ANNEXURE P-4."

2. A perusal thereto would indicate that some amount has been remitted back to the petitioner and the same is stated to be in contravention of the directions contained in orders dated 15.10.2025 and 02.02.2026.
3. The Court has perused the order dated 15.10.2025 and finds that respondents were restrained from taking any coercive action against the petitioner. The deposition of the amount or its remittance by the respondents to the petitioner's account cannot be construed to be a coercive action against the petitioner.
4. If the petitioner has any other grievance, the petitioner shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.
5. With the aforesaid observations, finding no justification to initiate contempt action against the respondents, this petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

MAY 26, 2026

aks