



\$~124

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1198/2025**

NARESH BEDI

.....Petitioner

Through: Senior Counsel (Appearance not given)

versus

VANDANA BEDI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **07.08.2025**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CM APPL. 48454/2025(Exemption)

2. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The application stands disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 1198/2025

3. The present petition under Section 2 (B) read with Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Section 151 of the CPC seeks the following prayers:-

“i) Issue notice to the contemnors to appear in person before this Hon'ble court;

ii) Initiate appropriate contempt proceedings against the respondents and punish them in accordance with law;

iii) Hold the respondents/contemnors guilty of wilful and deliberate contempt of court for disobedience of the final judgment and decree dated 22.07.2019 in CS(OS) 452/2016;

iv) Restrain the Respondent, their agents, assigns or any person acting on their behalf from transferring, selling, encumbering,



entering or otherwise dealing with the suit property bearing No. D-28, Rajouri Garden, New Delhi;

v) Pass such other and further orders as may be deemed fit in the interest of justice.”

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that by way of a decree in CS (OS) 452/2016, the coordinate bench vide order dated 22.07.2019 has passed the following directions:-

“19. The counsel for the plaintiff contends, (a) that the suit property was purchased in the name of plaintiff, defendant no.1 and in the names of father and mother of the plaintiff, with each of them having 25% share therein; (b) the plaintiff claims that the father and mother of the plaintiff have executed a Will bequeathing their 25% share each in favour of the plaintiff and leaving, besides the plaintiff, defendants no.4 and 5 viz. Rajesh Bedi and Subhash Bedi as sons and defendant no.6 Shashi Badhwar as daughter; (c) that defendants no.4 and 5 have accepted the Will of father and mother set up by the plaintiff, by filing written statements in this suit; (d) that the defendant no.6 Shashi Badhwar is challenging the Will set up by the plaintiff of father and mother; (e) that the defendants no.1&2 have filed a Counter-Claim for declaration that the Wills of the father and mother, set up by the plaintiff, are forged, fabricated, unnatural, improbable and unfair, and of permanent injunction restraining the plaintiff from dealing with the property; (f) that the defendant no.1, being the daughter-in-law of the deceased father and mother of the plaintiff, has no caveatable interest and is not entitled to challenge the Wills; and, (g) similarly, defendants no.2 and 3, who are the son and daughter-in-law of the plaintiff and defendant no.1, have no caveatable interest and the dispute qua Will is inter se plaintiff and defendant no.6 Shashi Badhwar only.”

5. Learned Senior Counsel submits that the subsequently, respondent no.1 has gifted her share of the property to respondent no.2 i.e. daughter of the petitioner and respondent no.1. Thereafter it is pointed out that respondent



no.2 has sold her share without adhering to the terms of the decree, as pointed out hereinbefore.

6. On the petitioner taking necessary steps, issue notice to respondent no.1 and 2, through all permissible modes, returnable for the next date of hearing.

7. List on 27.11.2025.

AMIT SHARMA, J

AUGUST 7, 2025/nk/sp