



\$~76

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1650/2025**
KUSUM LATA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. (Counsel for the Petitioner
appearance not given).

versus

DR NAVLENDRA KUMAR SINGH, ADDL. DIRECTOR
AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain ASC, Ms.
Jyoti Tyagi, Ms. Vishruti
Pandey, Mr. Sachin Garg,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **15.01.2026**

1. The Petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of the Court under the Contempt of Court Act, 1971, while alleging that interim order dated 02.04.2025, directing the Respondents to release Petitioner's salary within a period of four weeks from the date of order, has not been complied with.

2. Admittedly, the salary of the Petitioner has already been paid as noticed in the order dated 13.11.2025, which reads as under:

"1. We find that, despite repeated complaints of the petitioner and orders of this Court, the respondents keep delaying the release of salary to the petitioner, thereby forcing the petitioner to approach this Court by way of contempt, and only thereafter, the salary of the petitioner is released. This time as well, the salary for the Month of July, 2025 till date has been released to the petitioner only after the filing of the present contempt petition.

2. As the salary has been released, we do not deem it necessary to proceed further with the present contempt petition. However, for forcing the petitioner to approach this Court by way of contempt,



we impose costs on the officer due to whose lapse the salary could not be released to the petitioner in time. The respondents must identify such officer and inform us, by way of an affidavit, the particulars of such officer. Such officer shall pay costs of Rs.15,000/- to the petitioner for this delay in the release of the salary.

3. We further make it clear that in case the salary of the petitioner is delayed again in the future, we may not take a lenient view of the delayed release of salary and may proceed with the contempt petition, if any, filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law and taking a strict view thereof.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is also getting a salary lesser than her counterparts, without any reason being assigned for the same.

5. In the affidavit that is to be filed by the respondents, the respondents must also disclose the reason for the disparity in the salary of the petitioner as compared to that of her counterparts.

6. Let the affidavit be filed within a period of four weeks from today.

7. List on 15th January, 2026.”

3. The Respondent has also filed a compliance affidavit dated 31.12.2025, admitting the delay in disbursal of the salary. Cost imposed by order dated 13.11.2025 is also stated to have been paid.

4. The learned counsel representing the Respondents, on instructions from the concerned authority, submits that in future there will not be any delay in release of the salary of the petitioner.

5. In view of the aforesaid facts, the present contempt proceedings are closed and disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 15, 2026

DU