



\$~108

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

% ***Date of Decision: 19th February, 2025***

+ CONT.CAS(C) 108/2025

JAI KISHAN KHANNA DECEASED THROUGH HIS LR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kamal Kapoor, Advocate.

versus

REGISTRAR OF DELHI COOPERATIVE SOCIETES & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Paripoorn Singh and Mr. Anurag
Nasiar and Ms. A., Advocates for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner seeks initiation of contempt proceedings against concerned Registrar of Cooperative Societies (RCS) for violating order dated 28.03.2022 passed in W.P.(C) 11330/2016. While disposing of the above said writ petition, RCS was directed to decided the representation within four weeks.

2. Since no action was taken by the concerned RCS, the petitioner had to file a contempt petition earlier also which was registered as CONT. CAS(C) 1960/2023 and on the basis of the assurance given by the concerned Assistant Registrar, the above said contempt petition was disposed of by directing the order be passed within two weeks.

3. Now, the present contempt petition has been filed asserting that despite the above said specific assurance given by the concerned Registrar, nothing has been done and, therefore, contempt proceedings be initiated against her for wilful disobedience of the specific directions and for showing utter disregard of the order passed by this Court, which was primarily on the basis



of her own assurance.

4. Learned counsel for respondent does admit that there is a delay in doing the needful but at the same time supplements that the order has already been passed by the concerned RCS on 14.02.2025, a copy of which has been transmitted to the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the above said fact but submits that there is no reason assigned by the respondent as to why the directions were not complied within the time-frame given by this Court.

6. The concerned Assistant Registrar has also reportedly joined the proceedings through video-conferencing.

7. Learned counsel for petitioner also submits that the order is merely an *eye-wash* and he reserves his right to challenge the same by taking recourse to law.

8. Though the concerned RCS should have been extra-vigilant and circumspect as there were specific directions to RCS to pass order within the particular time-frame, keeping in mind the fact that the order has already been passed, this Court does not see any compelling reason to continue with the present contempt petition.

9. However, RCS is directed to be careful in future and to ensure strict and swift compliance of any such order.

10. The petition is, accordingly disposed of.

11. Needless to say, petitioner is at liberty to challenge the above said order, by taking appropriate action as permissible under law.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 19, 2025/ss