



\$~64

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 700/2026**

SOHAN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nupur Sachdeva, Adv. (Through
VC)

versus

**SANJEEV KHIRWAR, COMMISSIONER MUNICIPAL
CORPORATION OF DELHI (MCD).**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Parminder Singh, SC with Mr.
Aryansh Vaibhav, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

06.07.2026

1. The present contempt petition has been filed alleging disobedience of the order dated 07th January, 2026, passed in *W.P.(C) 160/2026*, titled as *Sohan Kumar and Ors. Versus Municipal Corporation of Delhi Through The Commissioner*.

2. This Court notes that *vide* order dated 07th January, 2026, following directions had been issued:

“xxx xxx xxx

7. Taking on record the aforesaid statement made on behalf of the Respondent/MCD, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Respondent to decide the Petitioners' representation dated 1st October, 2025 by way of a speaking order within a period of two months from today, setting out full particulars and reasons dealing with the grievances raised therein.

8. Should the Petitioners be aggrieved by the outcome, they shall be at liberty to take appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

xxx xxx xxx”



3. Today, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-Municipal Corporation of Delhi (“MCD”) has handed over to this Court a Status Report, which is taken on record.
4. As per the said Status Report individual Speaking Orders have been passed, by the respondent.
5. However, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner refutes the same, and submits that the said orders are not in the nature of Speaking Orders, and have been passed belatedly.
6. Accordingly, in case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the Speaking Orders passed by the respondent, the petitioner is at liberty to seek his remedies, in accordance with law.
7. Noting the aforesaid, the present petition is accordingly, disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

JULY 6, 2026/KR