

J"

CONTEMPT P.(Civil) 179 OF 2001
ITEM NO.30 COURT NO.8

SECTION XIV
A/N MATTER

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL) 179/2001 IN
SLP (C) 17454/2000

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

GOPI CHAND & ORS. Respondent (s)

(With Appln(s). for extension of time,initiating contempt
proceedings)

WITH

CONTEMPT PETN.(C) D.9145/2001 IN SLP (C) 17454/2000)(for prel.hearing)
(With Office Report)

and with I.A.4 IN SLP (C) 17454/2000
(for directions and office Report)

Date : 10/09/2001 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.B. SHAH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. SETHI

For the Petitioner (s)

Ms.Indra Sawhney,Adv.

Mrs.V.D. Khanna,Adv. (N/P)

For the Respondent (s)

Mr.Rajiv Tyagi,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

Contempt Petition (C) No.179/2001. Contempt@@
CC
Petition is disposed of in terms of the signed order.
C.P.(c) D.9145/2001 & IA 4 in SLP (c) 17454/2000@@
CC
Stand over for two weeks.

.SP1
(Vijay Kumar Sharma) (K.K. Chadha)
Court Master Court Master

Signed order in CP (c) 179/2001 is placed on the file.

.PA
.PL54

CONTEMPT PETITION (C) NO.179/2001@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

IN@@
CC

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NO.17454/2000@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI ..Petitioner

Versus

GOPI CHAND & ORS. ..Respondents

O R D E R@@
CCCCCCCC

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.....
.SP2

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents- contemnors states that most of the employees have vacated the premises as ordered by this Court. However, with regard to respondent Nos.1, 4 and 13 it is contended that their sons are in employment of the Municipal Corporation of Delhi and are entitled to this residential accommodation. This statement is disputed by the learned counsel appearing for the Municipal Corporation of Delhi.

Considering the fact that sons of respondent Nos. 1,4 and 13 are employees of the M.C.D. and if they are not entitled to allotment of the premises in question by allotting alternative premises as per their entitlement,

.PA

:-2:-

it would be open to the MCD to take necessary action for evicting them from the premises in question. Further, if the MCD has not paid retirement dues to respondent Nos. 1,4 and 13, it should take appropriate action for releasing the same.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

.SP1

.....J
(M.B. Shah)

.....J
(R.P. Sethi)

New Delhi,
September 10,2001