



2026:DHC:1596



\$~

\*

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

%

*Judgment reserved on: 02.02.2026*  
*Judgment pronounced on: 24.02.2026*

+

O.M.P.(I) (COMM.) 253/2024, I.A. 2555/2025 (Addl.Doc.) &  
I.A. 4127/2025 (Early Hearing)

**M/S WEDDING PARK HOSPITALITIES PVT LTD**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mrs. Nishtha Agarwal and Ms.  
Tamanna Bandyopadhyay,  
Advocates.

versus

**BALESH DEVI BHADANA & ANR.** .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rohit Gandhi and Mr.  
Hargun Singh Kalra,  
Advocates.

Mr. Parth Sharma, Advocate for  
R-1 to 3 in CCP(O) 103/2024.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN  
SHANKAR**

## **J U D G M E N T**

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.**

**CCP(O) 91/2024 (Contempt petition Under Sections 2, 10 & 12)**

**CCP(O) 103/2024 (Contempt petition Under Sections 2, 10 & 12)**

**CCP(O) 24/2025 (U/O XXXIX Rule 2A)**

1. With the consent of the parties, these three Contempt Petitions were taken up for hearing together, and shall now be disposed of by way of this common Judgement.



2026:DHC:1596



2. For the sake of convenience and clarity, the parties shall hereinafter be referred to in accordance with their respective ranks in O.M.P.(I)(COMM.) 253/2024, unless the context otherwise requires.

3. The Contempt Petition, being CCP(O) 91/2024, has been instituted under Sections 2, 10 and 12 of the **Contempt of Courts Act, 1971**<sup>1</sup>, read with Section 151 of the **Civil Procedure Code, 1908**<sup>2</sup>, by the Petitioner against the Respondents. By way of the said Petition, the Petitioner seeks initiation of contempt proceedings on the allegation of wilful disobedience of the Order dated 02.08.2024 passed by this Court.

4. The second Contempt Petition, being CCP(O) 103/2024, has been filed under Sections 2, 10 and 12 of the Contempt Act, read with Section 151 of the CPC, by the Petitioner against **Mr. Ankit Jain, Mr. Ankur Jain, Mr. Shubham Garg, Mr. Shyam Chawla, Mr. Tarun Lingwal, Ms. Dimple Singh and Mr. Pushkar Bhalani**<sup>3</sup>. It is alleged therein that the said individuals have violated the *status quo* order passed by this Court *vide* Order dated 02.08.2024.

5. Whereas, the Contempt Petition, being CCP(O) 24/2025, has been filed under Order XXXIX Rule 2A read with Section 151 of the CPC by the Respondents against certain officials of the Petitioner. Through the said Petition, the Respondents seek, *inter alia*, initiation of contempt proceedings on the allegation that the Petitioner overreached the judicial process by wrongfully pressurizing the learned Local Commissioner to alter his Report.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contempt Act

<sup>2</sup> CPC

<sup>3</sup> Owners and agents of Jain Caterers and Décor



2026:DHC:1596



**BRIEF FACTS:**

6. Shorn of unnecessary details, the facts germane to the present Contemp Petitions are as follows:

- (a). The parties herein entered into a **Lease Agreement dated 01.02.2017<sup>4</sup>** for the property **land admeasuring 67 Kanal, 14 Marla bearing Mustil No. 19, Killa No. 16(0-10), 24(2-13). 25(6-16), Mustil No. 20, Killa no. 4(6-8), 6(8-0), 6(7-17), 7(6-11), 13(0-9), 14(7-18), 15(6-12), 18(6-0), Mustil No. 37, Killa no. 8/1(3-7), kita 16, business name as “Jannat Valley” situated at village Mewla Maharajpur, Tehsil Badhkal, District Faridabad<sup>5</sup>**.
- (b). Subsequently, certain disputes arose between the parties, as a result of which, it is stated, the Petitioner invoked arbitration *vide* Notice dated 18.07.2024. However, pending the constitution of the arbitral tribunal, the Petitioner approached this Court by filing O.M.P.(I)(COMM.) No. 253/2024 under Section 9 of **the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996<sup>6</sup>**, seeking interim protection of possession, restraint against creation of third-party rights, and protection of its assets, business operations, brand name and goodwill.
- (c). By order dated 02.08.2024, this Court granted interim relief including an order of *status quo* in respect of the subject premises, in favour of the Petitioner, *inter alia*, restraining the Respondents and all persons acting on their behalf from interfering with the Petitioner’s rights in respect of the subject

---

<sup>4</sup> Lease Agreement

<sup>5</sup> Subject Premises

<sup>6</sup> Act



2026:DHC:1596



premises, creating third-party interests and from dealing with, utilising or exploiting the Petitioner's assets, business operations, brand name or goodwill.

- (d). Alleging wilful and deliberate disobedience by the Respondents and the Owners and agents of Jain Caterers and Décor, of the Order dated 02.08.2024, the Petitioner initiated contempt proceedings, being CCP(O) 91/2024 and CCP(O) 103/2024, asserting that they continued to operate from the subject premises, advertised the venue, solicited bookings for weddings and events, represented themselves as operators of "Jannat Valley", and collected monies from prospective customers in clear disregard of the subsisting judicial restraints.
- (e). During the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, this Court, by Order dated 08.11.2024, appointed the learned Local Commissioner, Mr. Aditya Vikram Singh Chauhan (Advocate), to visit the subject premises, record the factual position, and submit a report.
- (f). In the *interregnum*, a Petition under Section 11 of the Act also came to be filed, being ARB. P. 1361/2024, and this Court, *vide* Order dated 10.12.2024, appointed an Arbitrator to adjudicate the disputes *inter se* the parties.
- (g). In view of such appointment and reference of the disputes of the parties to arbitration, this Court, *vide* a separate Order dated 10.12.2024, directed that the captioned Section 9 Petition be treated as an Application under Section 17 of the Act and be adjudicated upon by the learned Arbitrator.
- (h). The Respondents subsequently instituted contempt proceedings,



2026:DHC:1596



being CCP(O) 24/2025, against certain officials of the Petitioner, raising certain allegations with respect to attempted overreach of the judicial process by the Petitioner Company, alleging unlawful pressurising and influencing of the learned Local Commissioner, with a view to procuring alteration or dilution of the learned Commissioner's report.

**CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES:**

7. Learned counsel for the Petitioner would contend that Respondents and the Owners and agents of Jain Caterers and Décor have acted in clear, conscious and deliberate violation of the order dated 02.08.2024 passed by this Court, despite having full knowledge of the same.

8. She would contend that the Respondents have, despite the *status quo* Order passed by this Court, gone ahead and carried out construction on the subject premises, created third-party rights in favour of Jain Caterers and Decors, and scheduled and hosted events at the subject premises.

9. She would further contend that the Order dated 02.08.2024 unequivocally directs that the *status quo* has to be maintained as respects the subject premises and no third-party rights shall be created by the Respondents. Further, it was directed that there shall be no interference with any assets lying in the leased area and no lease of the leased area in favour of any third-party shall be permitted or implemented. Clearly, by leasing out the subject premises, the Respondents have created third-party rights in favour of Jain Caterers and Decors, destroyed and misused the assets of the Petitioner and by



2026:DHC:1596



scheduling event bookings and holding events, violated the Order dated 02.08.2024 and disturbed the complete “stand still” that was directed by this Court.

10. **Per Contra**, the learned counsel for the Respondents would contend that, admittedly, on the date on which the *status quo* Order was passed, the Respondent, who is the owner of the subject premises, was in possession of the subject premises and taking bookings for events and hosting the same. It is also an admitted position that the Petitioner had vacated the property. Thus, to maintain the *status quo* would mean that the title and possession of the subject premises remain as is.

11. It would also be contended by the learned counsel for the Respondents that, as respects the allegation that third-party rights have been created, the Respondents have also not violated the direction of this Court to that aspect, and Jain Caterer and Decors are just the vendors who carry out services at the property for the events hosted by the Respondents and no third party rights have been created in their favour.

**ANALYSIS & CONCLUSION:**

12. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and, with their able assistance, perused the material on record.

13. At the outset, this Court deems it appropriate to extract the relevant portion of the Order dated 02.08.2024, passed in O.M.P.(I)(COMM.) 253/2024, which reads as under:

“....

15. In these circumstances, *prima facie*, the leased area continues to remain leased to the petitioner, and the respondents could not



have leased out the area to anyone else or blocked access of the petitioner to the leased area.

16. The submission that the petitioner has surrendered the lease is also *prima facie* not acceptable as there is no written document surrendering lease. In case the petitioner is in default of rent, Clause 10.2 envisages termination of the lease by the respondents on one month's advance notice in writing which has also not been given.

17. A *prima facie* case has, therefore, been made out by the petitioner of the continuation of the lease and of unlawful restraint against the petitioner having access to the leased area.

18. The principles of balance of convenience and irreparable loss would also clearly justify grant of *ad interim* injunction in such a case, as, if the respondents were to be permitted to lease out the area to another party, or to deal with assets of the petitioner which are contained in the leased area, it would naturally result in irreparable loss to the petitioner.

19. The balance of convenience would also, therefore, be in favour of a direction of *status quo* regarding the leased area till the next date of hearing.

20. In these circumstances, issue notice.

21. Notice is accepted, on behalf of the respondent, by Mr. Jinendra Jain.

22. Reply, if any, be filed within four weeks with advance copy to learned Counsel for the petitioner who may file rejoinder thereto, if any, within four weeks thereof.

23. Till the next date of hearing, the parties shall maintain *status quo* with respect to the leased area. There shall be no interference with any assets lying in the leased area and no lease of the leased area in favour of any third party shall be permitted or implemented.

....”

*(emphasis supplied)*

14. This Court also takes note of the fact that *vide* Order dated 10.12.2024, the captioned Section 9 Petition was directed to be converted into an Application under Section 17 of the Act, before the



2026:DHC:1596



learned Arbitrator. Further, as respects the *status quo* Order, the same was also relegated for confirmation before the learned Arbitrator.

15. This Court is of the considered view that once the Order dated 02.08.2024 itself came to be relegated for confirmation before the learned Arbitrator, this Court could not have continued to hold seisin over the issue.

16. A reading of the Order dated 02.08.2024 would lead this Court to conclude that what was finally directed was the maintenance of the *status quo*. The *status quo* as on the date when the Order was passed was that the Respondents were in possession of the said property and were holding events, wherein the alleged Contemnor in CCP(O) 103/2024, being Jain Caterers and Décor, were providing services to the Respondents for carrying out the said events on the said premises.

17. A perusal of paragraph 23 of the Order dated 02.08.2024 would make it clear that the operative direction issued by the Court was for the maintenance of the *status quo*. Though certain observations were made in the earlier part of the said Order, those observations are evidently *prima facie* in nature. Considering the facts and circumstances cumulatively, this Court is of the considered view that no wilful disobedience of the said Order can be attributed to the Respondents and the Owners and agents of Jain Caterers and Décor.

18. In any event, it is trite law that the contempt jurisdiction of this Court is to be exercised with the utmost circumspection and only in circumstances where a clear and unambiguous case of wilful disobedience of the orders of this Court is made out. The power to punish for contempt is extraordinary in character and is not intended to be invoked routinely or as a matter of course. It cannot be permitted



2026:DHC:1596



to assume the character of an alternative remedy for the enforcement of rights, nor can it be employed to settle disputed questions of fact between parties.

19. In this regard, this Court finds it apposite to take note of the observations made by the Division Bench of this Court in *Suman Sankar Bhunia v. Debarati Bhunia Chakraborty*<sup>7</sup>, wherein the legal position has been succinctly reiterated. The relevant paragraph of the said judgment reads as follows:

“74. It is trite that the jurisdiction in contempt is not intended to be invoked as a substitute for execution proceedings, nor as a forum for adjudicating contested factual narratives set up by rival parties. The power of contempt, being extraordinary in nature, is required to be exercised sparingly, cautiously, and only in cases where wilful and contumacious disobedience of court orders is clearly established. At the same time, this Court is conscious of the equally settled principle that no litigant can be permitted to undermine the authority of judicial orders or treat them as optional or inconsequential.”

20. In the present case, and as the Order dated 02.08.2024 reads, this Court is of the opinion that there is no wilful violation of the said Order as such.

21. In view of the same, this Court is of the opinion that there arises no need to exercise the powers of contempt bestowed upon this Court, and resultantly, the Contempt Petitions, being CCP(O) 91/2024 and CCP(O) 103/2024, stand dismissed.

22. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondents very candidly stated that in the event that this Court was not inclined to proceed with the contempt proceedings as against the Respondents, then he would not be pressing CCP(O) 24/2025.

---

<sup>7</sup> 2026 SCC OnLine Del 276



2026:DHC:1596



23. In view of the said statement, the Contempt Petition CCP(O) 24/2025 shall also stand dismissed.

24. Accordingly, the present Contempt Petitions, along with pending application(s), if any, are disposed of in the above terms.

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.**  
**FEBRUARY 24, 2026/tk/va**