



\$~14

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 13/2025 & CRL.M.A. 25047/2025**

VINOD KUMAR PANDEY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.M.S. Khan, Mr.M. Arshyan,
Mr.Akbar Kaleem, Ms.Shaziya
and Ms.Shoeba, Advs.

versus

ASHOK KUMAR AGGARWAL & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Rajesh Kumar, SPP (CBI)
with Ms. M. Pandita and
Mr.Changez Khan, Advs. for
R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER
22.01.2026

%

1. This petition has been filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking initiation of contempt proceedings under the said Act against the respondent no.1.
2. The present petition has been filed on the basis of the order dated 19.04.2025 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class-07, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi in Ct. Case no. 17929/2016, titled **Ashok Kr. Aggarwal v. V.K. Pandey**, which records as under:



“The undersigned is recusing the present case since complainant has tried to influence the court qua the present case.”

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as respondent no.1 had tried to influence the Court, his conduct amounts to criminal contempt.

4. During the course of these proceedings, a question had also arisen as to whether the learned Standing Counsel (Criminal) for the State of NCT of Delhi can delegate his powers under Section 15 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to the Additional Standing Counsel or to any other person, to initiate criminal contempt proceedings.

5. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, both on the maintainability of the present petition as also on merits.

6. As far as the question of maintainability is concerned, as we do not deem it appropriate to proceed further with the contempt petition, we leave the above question of law open to be adjudicated in appropriate proceedings.

7. On merits, we find that the order of the learned Court does not give us the complete details on the basis of which we can proceed against the respondent no. 1, especially in the exercise of our quasi-criminal jurisdiction of contempt. The learned court has also not deemed it fit to make a reference of the issue to us. We, therefore, are not in a position to express any opinion on the happenings before the learned Court, which prompted the learned Judge to transfer the matter.



8. We, therefore, do not deem it appropriate to proceed with this contempt case any further. The same, along with the pending application is, accordingly, dismissed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

JANUARY 22, 2026/ns/Yg