



\$~108

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 844/2025**

**HN WADHWA**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuj Kapoor and Mr. Shivom  
Sethi, Advocates

versus

**ASHOK CHANDRA & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh K Gautam, Mr, Anand  
Gautam, Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Mr.  
Deepanjali Chaudhary & Ms. Likivi  
K Jakhalu, Advs. for respondent  
bank.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL**

**ORDER**

%

**26.05.2025**

***Hearing has been conducted through Video Conferencing.***

1. This petition alleges wilful disobedience of order dated 27<sup>th</sup> January 2025 passed in **W.P. (C) No. 5295/2015**. The relevant directions have been extracted as under:

27. The facts of this case have already been considered in the earlier round of litigation, where this Court has come to the conclusion that the punishment imposed upon the petitioner cannot be sustained solely on the basis of the first imputation of charge. As noted above, the Court has recorded the finding that the second imputation was “*more serious*”, and specifically noted that the punishment to be imposed must consider the



fact that the petitioner did stay in the guest house and paid the claimed charges to Mr. B.K. Seth. It was directed that the extent of the misconduct must be viewed accordingly while imposing a commensurate punishment. Having regard to these findings in the judgment of the learned Single Judge, which has been upheld by the Division Bench and Special Leave to Appeal declined by the Supreme Court, I consider it appropriate to impose a punishment upon the petitioner at the level immediately below “removal from service”, as imposed by the respondent. The punishment is, therefore, substituted with an order of compulsory retirement.

28. The respondent is directed to compute the entitlements of the petitioner on this basis and to remit the same to him within a period of three months.

2. *Mr. Gautam*, Advocate appears for respondents and states that compliance has been done and he shall file the draft computation as well.
3. Counsel for petitioner who appears *through VC* states that he shall contact *Mr. Gautam*, in order to take the said draft computation.
4. Accordingly, this petition stands disposed of.
5. Liberty is granted to petitioner to revive the petition, in case of any residual grievance in this regard.
6. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

**ANISH DAYAL, J**

**MAY 26, 2025/SM/na**