



\$~80

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

+ W.P.(C) 17882/2025, CM APPL. 73908/2025 and CM APPL. 73910/2025

VINOD KUMAR GARG & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajinder Wali, Adv.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Rashmi Chopra, Sr. Adv.
along with Mrs. Shriparna
Chatterjee, Mr. Puneet Rathi and
Mr. Sharuk Qureshi, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

17.02.2026

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, 1950, seeking issuance of a Writ in the nature of *Certiorari* to quash the order dated 23.07.2025 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi [hereinafter referred to as 'Tribunal'], whereby the contempt proceedings initiated by the Petitioners (Applicants before the Tribunal), for alleged non-compliance of Order dated 12.01.2024, came to be dismissed.

2. The brief facts leading to the filing of the present petition are set out hereinafter.

3. The Tribunal, *vide* its Order dated 12.01.2024, while disposing of Original Application (OA) No.18/2020 filed by the Petitioners, issued the following direction:



“24. In this conspectus, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the O.A. with a direction to the respondents to have a relook in the matter and decide the claim of the applicants, in terms of the directions of the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi, referred to above, by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

3. Alleging non-compliance of the aforesaid directions, the Petitioners filed a petition initiating contempt proceedings before the Tribunal on the ground that the order dated 12.01.2024 has not been complied with. In response thereto, the Respondent filed a compliance affidavit enclosing an order dated 18.07.2025, whereby the representation of the Petitioners was rejected.

4. Notably, the order dated 18.07.2025 was passed during the pendency of the contempt petition. Thereafter, the Tribunal, upon noticing that the said order has been passed, proceeded to close the contempt proceedings.

5. Learned counsel representing the Petitioner submits that the directions issued by the Tribunal on 12.01.2024 have not been duly complied with and the Order dated 18.07.2025 is neither reasoned nor a speaking.

6. This Court has considered the submissions made by the learned counsel.

7. It is well settled that the jurisdiction exercised by a contempt court is limited and circumscribed. While examining a plea of contempt, the Court/Tribunal is only concerned with the question whether there has been wilful and deliberate disobedience of the direction issued by it. The correctness, adequacy, or legal sustainability of an order passed in purported compliance does not ordinarily fall within the scope of contempt jurisdiction.

8. In the present case, the direction contained in the order dated



12.01.2024 required the Respondents to reconsider the claim of the Petitioners. Following which, the Respondents, during the pendency of the contempt proceedings, passed an order dated 18.07.2025 dealing with the claim of the Petitioners.

9. Whether the said order sufficiently meets the requirement of being reasoned or speaking, or whether it correctly appreciates the directions of the Tribunal, are matters that pertain to the merits of the decision and would necessarily require substantive adjudication. Such issues cannot be gone into in proceedings for contempt, which are not intended to serve as a substitute for appellate or original adjudicatory remedies.

10. If the Petitioners are aggrieved by the contents or reasoning of the said order, the appropriate remedy available to them is to challenge the same by filing a fresh OA before the Tribunal and not by pursuing contempt proceedings.

11. With these observations, present Petition, along with pending applications, stand dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

FEBRUARY 17, 2026

s.godara/hr