



2025:DHC:6739-DB



\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 10307/2024, REVIEW PET. 421/2025 & CM APPL.
48574/2025

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHIPetitioners
Through: Ms. Garima Prasad, Sr. Adv.
with Ms. Namrata Mukim, SC with Ms.
Niharika Singh and Ms. Sakshi Saxena,
Advs. with Dr. Seema Sharma, Additional
Director (Education Department)

versus

SHAILENDER KUMAR AND ORSRespondents
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER (ORAL)
08.08.2025

%

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

REVIEW PET. 421/2025

1. This review petition, in our view, is a complete abuse of process of the Court.
2. The review petition seeks review of para 6 of order dated 6 February 2025 passed by us in CM APPL. 42208/2024.
3. The order dated 6 February 2025 read thus:



2025:DHC:6739-DB



“W.P.(C) 10307/2024

3. Written submissions have not been filed by the petitioner despite order dated 26 July 2024.

4. As this case relates to grant of MACP and there are several more urgent matters, of earlier years which are pending before this Bench, it is not possible to grant priority to this case.

5. Rule DB.

CM APPL. 42208/2024

6. We dispose of this application with a direction to the petitioner to comply with the order passed by the Tribunal within a period of four weeks from today, subject to the outcome of the writ petition. The application is disposed of.”

4. It appears that, as there was no compliance with the aforesaid directions, a contempt petition was filed against the petitioner. The Court apparently has taken serious notice of the matter which has prompted the petitioner now to move one more stay application, seeking stay all over again.

5. In order to be fair, we called upon learned Counsel for the petitioner as to whether it was willing to make a statement that it would comply with the order passed by the Tribunal, subject to the outcome of the writ petition, within four weeks. Learned Counsel is unable to make such a statement.

6. If that is the situation, if the petitioner is facing contempt proceedings, it is only because of its own default.

7. No case exists for us to review our decision.



2025:DHC:6739-DB



8. The review petition is dismissed.
9. The petition ordinarily ought to have entailed cost; however, we refrain from awarding any, as we are dismissing the application without issuing notice.

C. HARI SHANKAR, J.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J.

AUGUST 8, 2025/aky