



\$~5 & 6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CONT.CAS(C) 16/2016 & CM APPL. 39550/2024 , CM APPL.
68676/2025.

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTIONPetitioner

Through: Mr. R.K. Saini, Mr. Dashmesh
Tripathi, Advocates.

versus

DELHI ADMINISTRATION THR BDORespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Sameer Vashisht, Standing Counsel
along with Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel
Counsel and Ms. Khushboo Mittal,
Adv. for GNCTD.

Mr. Gaganmeet Singh Sachdeva, Mr.
Hridyesh Khanna and Mr. Harshpreet
Singh Chadha, Advs. for DDA.

(6)
+ W.P.(C) 3858/2025

NAND KISHOREPetitioner

Through: Mr. R.K. Saini, Mr. Dashmesh
Tripathi, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Sameer Vashisht, Standing Counsel
along with Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel
Counsel and Ms. Khushboo Mittal,
Adv. for GNCTD.

Mr. Gaganmeet Singh Sachdeva, Mr.
Hridyesh Khanna and Mr. Harshpreet
Singh Chadha, Advs. for DDA.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

01.12.2025

CM APPL. 75400/2025 (For amendment) in W.P.(C) 3858/2025

1. *Mr. R.K. Saini*, Counsel appearing for the applicant/petitioner, has not pressed the present application, and seeks leave to withdraw the same.
2. As such, the application stands dismissed as withdrawn.

CONT.CAS(C) 16/2016 & W.P.(C) 3858/2025

1. After both these matters are called out for hearing. *Mr. Sanjay Jain*, learned Senior Counsel assisted by *Mr. Sameer Vashisht*, Standing Counsel were intending to open their arguments.
2. Counsel appearing for the petitioner, *Mr. R.K. Saini*, who has not less than 25 years of standing to our knowledge, entered the Court Room leisurely with red stickfast tape on his lips.
3. We heard *Mr. Jain*, learned Senior Counsel, in view of the previous order of this Court, when we expressed our intention to initiate contempt proceedings against the senior officers of the State Government.
4. During the hearing, in response to the above, *Mr. Jain*, learned Senior Counsel, apprised this Court about the re-consideration of proposal by the State Government and the fresh offer made to the petitioner by the State Government, in writing.
5. Such proposal in the form of offer was made available to the counsel for petitioner, *Mr. R.K. Saini*. *Mr. Jain*, learned Senior Counsel, explained the proposal to this Court and to the other side.



6. When confronted, *Mr. R.K. Saini*, Counsel appearing for petitioner removed the red tape from his lips, which initially prompted us to believe that *Mr. Saini* had some injuries on his face. When inquired, it was informed by *Mr. Saini* that on the last two hearings, he was stopped midway by the Court during his arguments and as such he has placed those red tapes on his lips, symbolizing that he had been silenced.

7. The aforesaid conduct of *Mr. Saini* warrants us to place on record that the arguments canvassed by *Mr. Saini* on last couple of occasions before this Court were getting too lengthy and repetitive, and this Court upon appreciating the case of petitioner requested *Mr. Saini* to stop from arguing further, so that we could have the response of the counsel for the other side.

8. In this context, conduct of *Mr. Saini*, as demonstrated today in the Court, is completely in poor taste and unexpected of a lawyer of the stature of *Mr. Saini* who, in our understanding, has standing of more than 25 years.

9. This could have prompted us to pass appropriate orders against *Mr. Saini*, however, considering his standing, we have refrained ourselves from passing such order. However, we place on record our strong displeasure to the unbecoming and unbefitting conduct of Advocate *Mr. R.K. Saini*.

10. On merits, *Mr. Saini* has expressed that he is not willing to accept the proposal given by State Government, even if the State Government is willing to increase the amount of compensation of Rs.5,00,000/-, which is a reasonable sum, offered in the proposal.

11. *Mr. Sanjay Jain*, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the State Government, by way of last chance, has sought time to file his response in the form of affidavit to be sworn by some senior officers of the State Government, both in the Contempt Petition, as also the Writ Petition.



12. As such, we grant time of two weeks, as prayed, to the counsel appearing for respondent, in view of aforesaid developments.
13. We further grant time of two weeks to the counsel appearing for the petitioner, whom advance copy of affidavit shall be served by the counsel for respondent for filing his rejoinder.
14. We direct both these matters to be listed on 21st January 2026.
15. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, J

ANISH DAYAL, J

DECEMBER 1, 2025/MK/sp