



\$~40 to 59

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

- + CRL.M.C. 4870/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18570/2024, CRL.M.A. 31260/2025
- + CRL.M.C. 4871/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18573/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4872/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18576/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4882/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18614/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4873/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18579/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4883/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18617/2024
- + CRL.REV.P. 799/2024, CRL.M.A. 18632/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18635/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4876/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18588/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4878/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18602/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4886/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18630/2024
- + CRL.REV.P. 798/2024 & CRL.M.A. 31268/2025
- + CRL.M.C. 4879/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18605/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4880/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18608/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4881/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18611/2024
- + CRL.M.C. 4885/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18623/2024
- + CRL.REV.P. 797/2024, CRL.M.A. 18593/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18596/2024
- + CRL.REV.P. 800/2024, CRL.M.A. 18636/2024 & CRL.M.A. 18639/2024
- + CRL.REV.P. 801/2024, CRL.M.A. 18640/2024, CRL.M.A. 18643/2024
- + CRL.REV.P. 802/2024, CRL.M.A. 18644/2024, CRL.M.A. 18647/2024
- + CRL.REV.P. 803/2024, CRL.M.A. 18648/2024, CRL.M.A. 18651/2024

SH. RAJPAL NAURANG YADAV & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abhijat, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Piyush Sanghi, Ms. Khushbu
Sahu, Mr. Nikhil Singh, Mr.
Raahithya Raj Mishra, Ms. Sana
Praveen, Mr. Sujith Suresh, Mr.



Jayant Yadav and Mr. Aditya Singh
Raghuvanshi, Advocates alongwith
petitioner no. 1 in person

versus

M/S. MURLI PROJECTS PVT. LTD & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Avneet Singh Sikka, Advocate
for R-1

CORAM:
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **05.02.2026**

1. The case is listed for filing the compliance report.
2. The petitioner no.1 has appeared alongwith his counsels.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner could not comply with the order directing him to surrender before the Jail Superintendent, Tihar at 4:00 PM yesterday, since he was trying to arrange money to be paid to the respondent and could not reach Delhi by 4:00 PM. He had reached Delhi at 5:00 PM and, therefore, did not surrender. It is stated that the request of the petitioner be treated as a mercy plea and that the order directing him to surrender before the Jail Superintendent, Tihar be recalled to enable the petitioner to arrange for money to repay the dues towards him. It is also stated that a payment schedule has been handed over to the respondents and that the petitioner will adhere to the said schedule. It is further stated that the petitioner is ready to pay a demand draft of Rs. 25 lakhs to the respondent.
4. This Court, at the outset, records its strong disapproval of the non-



compliance of the order of this Court, *vide* which the petitioner had been directed to surrender before the Jail Superintendent, Tihar, at 4:00 PM yesterday. The excuse given by the petitioner that he reached at 5:00 PM and, therefore, could not surrender at 4:00 PM has to be rejected outright, since even if he had reached Delhi at 5:00 PM, nothing prevented him from complying with the order of this Court.

5. Additionally, the order directing him to surrender on 04.02.2026 at 4:00 PM was passed on 02.02.2026 in the presence of his counsels, was uploaded on the website of this Court, and was reiterated yesterday when his application for extension of time to surrender was rejected. The order passed yesterday was uploaded the same evening, leaving no room for any confusion that he was required to surrender yesterday at 4:00 PM. To reiterate, he was granted two additional days' time to surrender, at his request, on 02.02.2026, making it clear beyond any doubt as to when he was to reach Delhi and when he was to surrender.

6. Unfortunately, this conduct rather reflects scant respect for law and when seen in the light of his past conduct of non-compliances of the order of the Court despite repeated assurances, strengthens this opinion.

7. Those who do not respect and honor law, themselves should not expect anything favourable from law. The law rewards its compliance, not its contempt. Extending continuous leniency to a person who has been disregarding the directions of the law would rather also send a message to the community that the law and Court's directions can be disregarded repeatedly without being punished for it. This Court, cannot, allow this message to be conveyed, by now recalling its order when the conduct of the



petitioner before it does not merit it.

8. This Court cannot be expected to show or create special circumstances for any person merely because such a person belongs to a particular background or industry. A Court of law looks through only from the prism of equality as per law. While this Court, in the present case, has shown sufficient leniency towards the petitioner, it cannot lose sight of the plight of the complainant. The interests of justice require this Court to walk a careful line between compassion and discipline. Leniency, though sometimes necessary, cannot be extended endlessly, especially when it is met with continued non-compliance.

9. In these circumstances, this Court finds no merit in the plea of the counsel for the petitioner to recall its order directing surrender of the petitioner before the Jail Superintendent, Tihar. He is directed to surrender the Jail Superintendent, Tihar, immediately today.

10. Put up for compliance on 07.02.2026.

11. In case, the respondents are still willing to enter into a compromise or re-schedule payment plan, as is submitted by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, the Court be informed about it on 07.02.2026.

12. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 05, 2026/ns
T.S.