



\$~51

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

+ LPA 164/2026 & CM APPLs. 19317-20/2026

SUSHIL KUMAR SAHNIAppellant

Through: Mr.Suresh Kumar Sahni, Adv. with
Mr.Satwik Parikh, Adv.

versus

MS. KOMITA SINGH & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr.Manish Kaushik, Adv. with
Mr.Mishal Johari, Mr.Ankit Batra and
Mr.Mainak Sarkar, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER
27.03.2026

%

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the appellant has stated that the appellant was not originally a party to the proceedings of the contempt case. He has rather been ordered to be impleaded during pendency of the contempt case. He has further stated that he is not bound by the order in respect of which the contempt petition has been moved for the reason that he was not a party to those proceedings and therefore, no contempt proceedings could be initiated against the appellant.
3. All these aspects can be looked into and decided by learned Contempt Judge, once the appellant files his reply to the contempt petition.
4. Accordingly, we dispose of this appeal granting liberty to the appellant



to file reply to the contempt case within four weeks.

5. We also permit the appellant to take all the issues including any preliminary issue, which may be available to him under law.

6. We request the learned Single Judge to decide such issues if raised by the appellant along with all other issues, which are pending for his consideration in the contempt case.

7. The appeal along with pending applications, thus, stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

MARCH 27, 2026

“shailndra”