



\$~95

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1662/2025**

ASHVINI KUMAR SHARMAPetitioner

Through: **Mr. Ankur Vyas, Adv.**

versus

GOVIND MOHAN & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Sushil Kumar Pandey, SPC, Mr. Aman Kr. Pandey and Mr. Pradip Sharma, Adv.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

06.04.2026

CM APPL.21601/2026 (for directions)

1. This is an application seeking urgent directions.
2. Considering the averments made in the application, CONT.CAS(C) 1662/2025 is taken up for hearing today itself.
3. The application stands disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 1662/2025

4. It is noticed that *vide* order dated 07.11.2025, it was ordered as under:

“1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

2. The present petition under Sections 2(b) and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India, 1950 seeks the following prayers: -

“a. Pass an order initiating contempt proceedings against the Alleged Contemnors for wilful and deliberate non-compliance/violation of Judgment dated 11.09.2025;

b. Direct the Alleged Contemnors to immediately comply with the directions passed by the Hon'ble Court in Judgment dated 11.09.2025;



c. Punish the Alleged Contemnors in accordance with the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971;

d. Pass any further orders/ directions as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case."

3. *Vide judgment dated 11.09.2025 in W.P.(C) No. 1855/2025, learned Division Bench of this Court passed the following directions:-*

"29. In these circumstances, we allow the writ petition in the following terms:

(i) We hold the petitioner to be entitled to disability compensation in terms of Rule 9(3) of the CCS (EOP) Rules.

(ii) The said compensation shall be released to the petitioner w.e.f. the date of issuance of the Suitability Certificate dated 27 September 2017, with interest from that date @ 9% p.a. till the date when the disability compensation is released to the petitioner.

(iii) We direct that the aforesaid amounts be released to the petitioner positively within two weeks from today.

30. *Given the manner in which the petitioner has had to suffer despite the injury that he bore in 2001, we would have been inclined to award punitive costs in this case. However, as we have awarded interest on the disability compensation granted by us, we refrain from doing so."*

4. *Issue notice.*

5. *Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents accepts notice.*

6. *Let a compliance affidavit be placed on record before the next date of hearing.*

7. *In case of non-compliance, the concerned Officer shall remain present in the Court, on the next date of hearing."*

5. It transpires that there has been no compliance with the directions contained in the judgment dated 11.09.2025, nor with the aforesaid order dated 07.11.2025.



6. Today, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the directions contained in the judgment dated 11.09.2025 are under compliance. However, he is unable to indicate a clear time frame for compliance.

7. Let the necessary compliance be done within a period of four weeks from today and a compliance affidavit be filed before the next date of hearing.

8. It can only be emphasized that expeditious compliance is required in the present case in the light of the observations made by the Division Bench in the judgment dated 11.09.2025 passed in W.P.(C) 1855/2023, wherein it has been emphasized that the petitioner is war veteran and has been litigating for almost more than 2 ½ decades to obtain his entitlement. The relevant observations rendered by the Division Bench are as under:

“22. The manner in which the petitioner’s claim has been dealt with is a matter of concern. We do not wish to second guess the reason as to why the petitioner, who was a war veteran who had suffered 42% hearing loss attributable to an injury borne by him on the warfront in 2001, has had to wait for 24 years as on date for obtaining his entitlement.

23. Even today, the respondents are not willing to concede to the petitioner’s claim, but have gone to the extent of submitting before the Court that the petitioner was medically fit for 16 years between 2001 and 2017.

24. We are hardly in a position to record our views on such a submission, in the face of all the material cited supra.

...

27. ...we fail to see why the respondents could not have released disability compensation to the petitioner. The petitioner cannot be expected to approach the respondents with a begging bowl, asking for his due entitlement under the Rules. It was for the respondents, in fact, to have released the petitioner’s dues on coming to learn of the fact that the petitioner had actually suffered disability which was attributable to the injury borne by him in 2001.”

9. Considering the circumstances, it is directed that if the directions



contained in the judgment dated 11.09.2025, remain un-complied with, the respondent no.2 shall join the proceedings virtually on the next date of hearing.

10. List on 07.07.2026.

SACHIN DATTA, J

APRIL 6, 2026/cl