



\$~83 and 84

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CS(OS) 5/2012, I.A. 10222/2017, I.A. 5686/2018, I.A. 12531/2018,
I.A. 12532/2018, I.A. 379/2019, I.A. 11902/2019, I.A. 11903/2019,
I.A. 11904/2019, I.A. 11907/2019, I.A. 12059/2019, I.A. 5819/2020,
I.A. 1082/2021, I.A. 467/2022, I.A. 6164/2022, I.A. 6165/2022, I.A.
7332/2023, I.A. 25370/2023 & I.A. 6811/2025

YASHWANT SINGH

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. V. Anush Raajan and Mr.
Pradyumn Yadav, Advocates.
versus

ASHUTOSH VERMA

.....Defendant

Through: Mr. Umesh C Sharma, Mr.
Srichandan Parhi and Mr. Ashu Choudhary,
Advocates.

84

+ CS(OS) 508/2012, I.A. 3903/2012, I.A. 921/2013, I.A. 922/2013, I.A.
12060/2019, I.A. 1437/2020, I.A. 1489/2020, I.A. 16166/2022, I.A.
2384/2023 & I.A. 2386/2023

ASHUTOSH VERMA

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Umesh C Sharma, Mr.
Srichandan Parhi and Mr. Ashu Choudhary,
Advocates.

versus

YASHWANT SINGH AND OTHERS

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. V. Anush Raajan and Mr.
Pradyumn Yadav, Advocates.
Ms. Jayashree Shukla Dasgupta, Ms. Rishika
Ahuja and Mr. Shivam Nayyar, Advocates for D4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

24.09.2025

%



1. On 22.09.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

"I.A. 25370/2023 (u/O XXXIX Rule 2-A CPC r/w Section 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971) in CS(OS) 5/2012

4. Learned counsel for the Plaintiff submits that there is willful and deliberate violation and non-compliance of order dated 14.05.2018 passed by this Court in I.A. No. 4108/2018, wherein Defendant had undertaken to pay the monthly rent of Rs. 1 lakh directly in the bank account of the Plaintiff. It is urged that Defendant has been regularly violating the orders of this Court in the past and serious observations have been made against him by this Court in orders dated 16.12.2021 and 17.05.2022.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the Defendant seeks and is granted two days to come back with instructions with respect to time period within which outstanding dues towards rent shall be cleared.

6. At request, list on 24.09.2025 at 02:30 P.M., on which date the Defendant shall remain present in Court."

2. It can be seen from the order that Defendant has *prima facie* not complied with order dated 14.05.2018, wherein he had undertaken to transfer monthly rent of Rs.1,00,000/- in the bank account of the Plaintiff. Till date as per the Plaintiff the order has not been complied with. Counsel for the Plaintiff draws the attention of the Court to order dated 16.12.2021 passed in I.A. 11037/2021 under Order XXXIX Rule 2A CPC filed by the Plaintiff alleging disobedience of order dated 21.12.2012, where the Court has noted that the Defendant had wilfully disobeyed the order and was not apologetic. Court had refrained from taking further action on the ground that the Defendant is an advocate *albeit* noting that his conduct would remain under scrutiny.

3. Counsel also draws the attention of the Court to order dated 17.05.2022 in a second contempt application filed by the Plaintiff, where the Court was constrained to observe that Defendant cannot be allowed to overreach judicial order and that orders of the Court must be strictly complied with. It was observed that the Defendant has scant regard for Court



orders and therefore, a message needs to be sent since casual approach towards compliance of Court orders cannot be tolerated. Show cause notice was issued to the Defendant to show cause why contempt action be not initiated observing that suspension of punitive action against him needs to be revoked.

4. The purpose of reflecting on these orders is that the observations of the Court are pointers to the fact that Defendant has scant regard for orders of the Court and is habitual of violating them, perhaps under a misconception that being an advocate, he is above the law. The inherent tendency of the Defendant to violate Court orders with impunity is again demonstrated by the non-compliance of order dated 14.05.2018, wherein it is recorded that the Defendant undertook to pay monthly rent to the Plaintiff. Seven years down the line the order has not been complied, save and accept, some money having been paid, according to counsel for the Defendant. Despite clear directions of the Court to the Defendant on 22.09.2025, he is not present today. No application has been filed for exemption and it needs a mention that in the course of hearing, counsel for the Defendant has given three different reasons for Defendant's absence, starting from fracture in the leg to ligament rupture to his being out of station. It is clear that the Defendant is evading the Court proceedings and is far from remorseful for his misdeeds.

5. Accordingly, issue bailable warrants against the Defendant, which shall be executed by SHO, Police Station, Greater Kailash Enclave 1, Greater Kailash, New Delhi in the sum of Rs.10,000/- returnable on 17.10.2025.



6. Copy of the order will be sent by the Registry to the concerned SHO for information and compliance.

SEPTEMBER 24, 2025
Ch

JYOTI SINGH, J