

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CROCP-1-2022 (O&M)
Reserved on: 07.08.2026.
Date of order: 07.09.2026.

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

.....Appellant

VERSUS

RAM NIWAS AGGARWAL

..... Respondent-contemnor.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present:- Mr. Gurfateh Singh Khosa, Amicus Curiae.

Mr. Ram Niwas Aggarwal, Contemnor in person
(through V.C).

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J.

1. CROCP-1-2022 is a suo motu criminal contempt petition registered by the Punjab and Haryana High Court against Sh. Ram Niwas Aggarwal ("the Respondent/Contemnor"), a private litigant of Hansi, District Hisar. The petition arises from material the Respondent himself filed in a decades-old criminal complaint concerning a petrol-pump partnership dispute. The underlying dispute, the manner in which the Respondent's own "show cause notices" came to be referred to the High Court, and the two-and-a-half-year internal administrative processing that preceded formal

registration of the contempt petition, are traced hereinafter, followed by the defence taken by the Respondent in his Reply dated 05.02.2024.

2. The Original Dispute — Petrol Pump Partnership (1976 onwards)

The root dispute is a civil/criminal partnership dispute concerning a Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. (BPCL) dealership, M/s Haryana Auto Service, Hansi (ODD-948, G.T. Road, Hansi):

A. On 01.07.1976, Ram Niwas Aggarwal (s/o Sh. Jagdish Rai) respondent-contemnor became a partner/dealer of the petrol pump under a Dealer-Partnership Supply Agreement (D.P.S.L.), along with Mrs Sudesh Lamba (w/o Sh. Naresh Lamba, nephew of Sh. Narender Singh Lamba) and Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal (s/o Sh. Mittar Sain Goyal).

B. Ram Niwas (contemnor) ran the pump and shared profits until 07.04.1987. He alleges that on 08.04.1987, Subhash Chand Goyal, aided by an outsider, Sh. Narender Singh Lamba, obtained his signature on a blank/single sheet of paper under threat, and thereafter forcibly ousted him from the business and threatened him with dire consequences if he returned.

C. A "Dissolution Deed" purportedly dated 05.10.1988 later surfaced, which BPCL treated as the basis for running the dealership without Ram Niwas. He contends this deed is forged — pointing, among other things, to the fact that Narender Singh Lamba's signatures on the face of the deed are shown as crossed/cancelled, and that the deed was not disclosed for roughly 22 years.

D. Ram Niwas made repeated representations to BPCL seeking restoration of his one-third share; these went unaddressed, and BPCL continued to run the outlet on the strength of the disputed deed.

3. **The Criminal Complaint and its Long Procedural History**

The complainant was aggrieved and thereupon filed a complaint before the police dated 20.12.2005, alleging that he was forcibly ousted from the petrol pump by the other partners in 1987 and it was thoroughly investigated by the police and an inquiry report dated 27.01.2006 was submitted by the Deputy Superintendent of police, Hisar, concluding that no criminal offence was made out as per the allegations levelled.

Thereupon, the complainant approached this Court by filing criminal writ petition, CRM-M-32255-2007, seeking a direction for registration of FIR against Subhash Chand Goyal, Narinder Singh lamba, and the petitioners/officials of the BPCL, based on complaint dated 20.12.2005, filed by him to the police upon which no offence was found to have been made out against them. This Court however declined to issue a direction, and disposed of the petition vide order dated 21.05.2007, granting liberty to the complainant to approach the concerned Magistrate for the purpose.

Thereafter, on 24.12.2007, Ram Niwas Aggarwal filed a private criminal complaint No. 445-I of 2007, titled "Ram Niwas Vs. Narender (Singh Lamba) and others", under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 218 and 506 IPC, against eight persons — Narender Singh Lamba, Subhash Chand Goyal, and six BPCL officers — alleging that the 1988 dissolution deed was forged and prepared to cheat him out of the dealership. He sought a direction under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. to register an FIR.

A. The request under Section 156(3) was declined; the complainant proceeded it as a private complaint, which was dismissed on 17.08.2009 by the SDJM, Hansi (Sh. Ashwani Kumar Mehta) after recording and considering the preliminary evidence.

B. A revision petition No.49 of 2009 was filed aggrieved thereof. The same was allowed and the dismissal order was set aside vide order dated 06.05.2010 passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Hisar and the matter was remanded. Thereafter, on 02.11.2010, the trial court summoned all the above eight accused, in the said complaint.

C. Accused Nos. 1 & 2 (Narender Singh, Subhash Chand Goyal) obtained bail and also challenged the order of summoning. In the revision, the summoning order against them was set aside on 31.05.2012 by the Addl. Sessions Judge (Ms. Ritu Tagore). The complainant preferred a revision petition against that order vide CRM-M-22825-2012 which remained pending before the High Court.

D. The remaining six accused (BPCL officers) approached the High Court. Vide orders dated 17.01.2011/25.01.2011 in CrI. Misc. Nos. 1340-2011 and 2166-2011, Hon'ble Ms. Justice Nirmal Jit Kaur exempted their personal appearance before the trial court "except as and when required." A related petition, CrI. Misc. No. 32658-2011, was later filed by Accused Nos. 3-8, after the trial Court asked them to appear on 03.11.2011. The High Court vide its order dated 01.11.2011 again exempted their personal appearance.

E. Thereafter, the High Court repeatedly directed that the "interim order of exemption " to continue, without fixing specific dates. The original trial Court file was twice requisitioned by the High Court. Fresh orders dated

04.04.2019 and 01.08.2019 (in CRM-11243-2019/CRM-M-1340-2011 and in the connected petitions continued the interim protection and directed the trial Court to adjourn the case beyond the next date fixed before the High Court.

4. The Application Dated 08.08.2019 — Basis of the Contempt Reference

A. It was in this background that on 08.08.2019, complainant Ram Niwas Aggarwal moved an application before Ms. Nisha, Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.)-cum-Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate (SDJM), Hansi, seeking issuance of non-bailable warrants of arrest against the accused for their continued non-appearance, and custody of any accused who appeared that day.

B. Annexed to this application (and referred to within it) were "Show Cause Notices" earlier issued by the complainant himself — principally one dated 22.04.2019, addressed to roughly 28 named persons including Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal (a former MLA), Sh. Narender Singh Lamba and several BPCL officials — in which the complainant alleged that named Hon'ble Judges of the High Court (Justice Nirmal Jit Kaur and Justice Ramendra Jain) and named judicial officers of the Hisar district judiciary (Sh. Ashwani Kumar Mehta, Smt. Ritu Tagore, Smt. Shikha Yadav and Sh. Jai Bir Singh) had "got involved" with the accused and "passed illegal orders," and sought action against them, failing which he threatened to approach the President of India and Chief Justice of India.

C. Ms. Nisha, SDJM, by order dated 08.08.2019, dismissed the application for warrants of arrest holding that, in view of the High Court's continued interim orders exempting the accused's personal appearance until

the next date (16.10.2019), the trial court had no option but to adjourn the case. However, considering the defamatory language used by the complainant in the application and its annexures against the Hon'ble Judges and judicial officers, she directed that a separate reference, with copies of the application and annexures, be sent to the District & Sessions Judge, Hisar for further necessary action.

D. This reference (SDJM's letter No. 714 dated 09.08.2019) was forwarded by the District & Sessions Judge, Hisar to the Registrar General, High Court of Punjab and Haryana, vide letter No. 16721 dated 13.08.2019, "for information and necessary action." This forwarding is the origin of the file that eventually matured into CROCP-1-2022. The "complaint" is thus not a third party's complaint against the Respondent, but the Respondent's own show cause notices/applications, forwarded by the SDJM because of the language used in them concerning the judiciary and the Judges.

5. It was stated in the aforesaid reference that an application dated 08.08.2019 had been moved by the respondent-Contemnor Ram Niwas Aggarwal, for seeking issuance of warrants of arrest against the persons arraigned as an accused in the said complaint, notwithstanding the orders of the High Court passed in CRM-M-1340-2011, CRM-M-2166-2011 and CRM-M-32658-2011 whereby presence of the accused persons had been exempted. Along with the said application, the respondent-Contemnor appended annexures including a show cause notice wherein he had levelled allegations against the integrity of the Judges of the High Court as well as various Judicial Officers, alleging that they had been acting in concert with the accused persons while passing judicial orders. It was further stated in the

reference that even though the said application was dismissed vide order dated 08.08.2019, the reference was made to this Court, considering the defamatory and scandalous language used therein.

EXAMINATION OF THE CONTENTS OF THE APPLICATION AND THE ANNEXURES.

6. Some of the contents of the application moved by the complainant, before the trial Court paving way for reference being sent to this Court are extracted as under: -

“1. That the order dated 4.4.2019 of Sh. Ramendra Jain in Application No CRM 11243 of 2019 has neither been continued nor any speaking order to any of the Accuseds has been issued on 1.8.2019 the date fixed in the order dated 4.4.2019.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

2.1. That these orders were issued without issuing any notice to my Lawyer (to Respondent Lawyer) on 4.4.2019 instead the Notice was issued for the date 1.8.2019 on which these orders were to be expired on 1.8.2019.

2.2. That in these orders proceedings were stayed for more than 8 years and 6 months while these can not be stayed for more than 6 months.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

2.4. That this Ld. Court obeyed these illegal orders in adjourning the hearing to 8.8.2019 ignoring the Law points ordered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court not to stay the trial beyond six months of Stay without waiting for any Speaking order or without any specific Speaking order.

3. That the fact that these illegal orders were obtained by the accuseds by involving Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain has not been denied by any of the Respondents in my attached show Cause Notice dated 22.4.2019 to all the accuseds and to whom whose

names should be either added in this complaint or a separate FIR/complaint be filed against them for the continuity of their offences.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

5. *That as the Respondents have not denied / explained my show Cause Notice dated 22.4.2019 and the other show Cause Notices mentioned in it for their involving Hon'ble Judges. By sending all of these unreplied show Cause Notices to Hon'ble Chief Justice of Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble Chief Justice of Our High Court through Hon'ble President of India with Affidavit if I am **Compelled** then I may request their Honours for **the Criminal action u/s Corruption** against all the Respondents and the Hon'ble Judges whose involvements has not been denied by them.”*

7. Along with the aforesaid application, he had also appended a copy of the Legal Notice dated 22.04.2019 which was sent to as many as 28 different persons. The subject thereof reads thus: -

“Subject:- Show Cause Notice for not ensuring appearance of eight accuseds of my complaint No 445-1 of 2007 in the Ld S.D.J.M Court Hansi and for running my petrol pump on the basis of forged Dissolution Deed Dated 5.10.1988. Involving Ms. Justice Nirmaljit Kaur and Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain Hon'ble Judges of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court for their orders dated 17.1.2011, 25.1.2011. And 4.4.2019, Sh. Ashwani Goyal Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi for his orders dated 17.8.2009, Smt. Ritu Tagore Ld. Addl. Session Judge, Hisar for his orders dated 31.5.2012, Smt. Shikha Yadav Ld. A.C.J. (Sr. Division) Hansi for his orders dated 18.3.2015 and Sh. Jai Bir Singh Ld. Addl. Distt. Judge Hisar for his orders dated 30.5.2017. Their involvement is not denied by Sh Subhash Chand Goyal and all of the Respondents in unreplied show Cause

Notices dated 16.6.2012, 12.1.2015, 21.1.2018, 4.2.2019 and 4.4.2019.”

8. Scurrilous extract of the said legal notice reads thus: -

“10. That after summoning orders dated 2.11.2010 Accuseds No 1 and 2 filed revision No 4 dated 14.1.2011 and involved Smt. Ritu Tagore Ld Additional Session Judge, Hisar for his orders dated 31.5.2012. For this she removed from the case file my Written reply to written Submission on behalf of the revisionist/Accuseds.

11. That Accuseds No 3 to 8 as know that the deed was forged, filed their revisions Cri. Misc. M – 1340 Of 2011 and Cri. Misc. M - 2166 of 2011 by involving Mrs. Justice Nirmaljit Kaur followingly:-

11.1. That as these accused had not appeared in the trial court even once and not filed their bail bonds and surity bonds Submitting their I.D and permanent Home addresses their APPEARANCE could not be exempted by the Hon'ble High court while BPCL not only financed their proceedings but also permoted them to very high posts while their posting could be only in the Jail.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

14. That yours conniveness is very clear and proved in involving the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain for his orders dated 4.4.2019 against the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 28.3.2018. Please answer the following questions:-

14.1. When in the orders dated 17.1.2011 and 25.1.2011 the Hon'ble High Court had asked you to appear as and when required by the Ld. Trial Court. Then why not you appeared on 22.9.2011 obeying the orders dated 10.8.2011?

14.2. When you illegally challenged the orders dated 22.9.2011 in 32658 then how and for what your APPEARANCE was exempted on 1.11.2011 contrary to the previous orders?

14.3. How both these contrary orders are continuing for eight years and your Advocate has been allowed more than 30 adjournments?

14.4. When there was No stay earlier then for what Sh. Ramendra Jain has stayed the proceedings of Ld. Trial Court for 9 years uptill 1.8.2019?

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

14.8. When Sh. Ramendra Jain stayed the Trial on 4.4.2019 to 1.8.2019 then why not he saw that the Accuseds were to appear on 20.2.2019 or on 28.3.2019 or on 2.4.2019 and when they had not appeared on these dates how he could stay the proceedings to 1.8.2019 without once APPEARANCE of the accuseds and without filing their bail bonds and surity bonds and IDs with their permanent Home addresses?

14.9. When the trial was fixed for 19.4.2019 then how Sh. Ramendra Jain without staying the proceedings and exempting the APPEARANCE of the accuseds by name on 19.4.2019 could hamper the proceedings dated 19.4.2019 for passing no orders on 19.4.2019 and stay the proceedings to 1.8.2019?

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

15. All of you with Criminal Conspiracy with Sh. Ramendra Jain have stayed the trial till 1.8.2019 as all of you expect that by that time you will be success in eliminating me but I have full faith in Almighty Sh. Shyam Baba.

16. That you must be knowing that by these orders dated 4.4.2019 you have enabled me to go to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India with the request.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

(B) To order the Hon'ble High court to transfer my file from Sh. Ramendra Jain sending as a prove the unreplied/undenied show Cause Notice dated 4.2.2019 to Sh Subhash Chand Goyal in which I asked him that as a Minister he obliged the family of Sh Ramendra Jain, the fact disclosed by his brother Sh. Shalendra Jain (Advocate), when I went to arrange him in this complaint, which he denied by giving details of obligations of Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal on them as Minister of I.N.L.D.

PROCEEDING UPON RECEIPT OF REFERENCE: -

9. The aforesaid application was forwarded by the District & Sessions Judge, Hisar to the Registrar General of this Court vide letter No. 16721 dated 13.08.2019. The same was processed by the Confidential Branch and, pursuant to the orders dated 16.09.2019 passed by the Registrar (Vigilance), the same was sent to the General Branch for taking necessary action. Thereafter, the General Branch forwarded a proposal for treating it as a 'Contempt of Court', in view of the allegations levelled therein. The matter was then sent to the Rules Branch for examining whether a Criminal contempt was made out or not. Vide order dated 23.7.2021, an order was passed by this Court to seek a report from the District & Sessions Judge, Hisar.

10. In compliance thereto, the District & Sessions Judge, Hisar had submitted his report, which examined the issue in detail and also perused the complaint filed. It was reported by him that the aforesaid complaint case had been filed by the respondent-Contemnor Ram Niwas Aggarwal against 08 persons for seeking directions to the SHO, Police Station City Hansi, under Section 156 (3), Cr. P.C for registration of an FIR. The said request was, however, declined and the matter was adjourned for recording of preliminary

evidence. Upon consideration of the preliminary evidence led by the respondent-Contemnor, the complaint was dismissed by the then Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Hansi Shri Ashwani Kumar Mehta vide order dated 17.08.2009, against which a revision had been filed. The same was allowed vide order dated 06.05.2010 passed by the then Court of Additional District & Sessions Judge, Hisar and the trial Court was directed to reconsider the order dated 17.08.2009 dismissing the complaint. It was further reported that in compliance with the remand, a fresh order was passed and vide its order dated 02.11.2010, the trial Court summoned all 08 accused persons to face trial for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, 218 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. The accused persons, Subhash Chand Goyal and Narender Singh, appeared and were granted regular bail in compliance with the order dated 06.12.2010 passed by Sandeep Garg. At the same time, vide order dated 14.01.2011, both the aforesaid accused preferred a revision petition against the order of summoning dated 02.11.2010, which was allowed by the Court of Ms. Ritu Tagore, the then Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, vide order dated 31.05.2012. He also reported that the other six accused persons had preferred CRM-M-1340-2011 and CM-M-2016 of 2011 respectively before the High Court, wherein, vide orders dated 17.04.2011 and 25.01.2011 respectively passed by Hon'ble Ms. Justice Nirmal Jit Kaur, Judge, Punjab & Haryana High Court, the personal appearance of the petitioner therein was ordered to be exempted before the trial Court except as and when required. Thereafter, vide order dated 22.09.2011, the trial Court had directed the accused to appear before the Court on 03.11.2011, however, vide order dated 01.11.2011 passed in CRM-M-32658-2011 wherein it was

recorded that the interim order passed for exemption had been ordered to be continued by the High Court with no specific date for its continuation and no further order was received from the High Court, hence, presence of the other 06 accused was considered to be exempted till further orders of the High Court. However, in the meanwhile, the original file was requisitioned by the High Court and the same was received back on 31.08.2017 when the complainant himself sought exemption from personal appearance till further orders received from the High Court. The said application was allowed, and the case remained pending awaiting orders from the High Court. The main file was received back on 28.09.2018.

11. Further, in its order of 31.05.2012 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, against the summoning order dated 02.11.2010, the order of summoning was set aside, against which the complainant preferred CRM-M-22825-2012. No further order had been placed on record by the complainant as to the decision on his petition. The High Court, vide its order dated 04.04.2019 passed in CRM-11243 of 2019 in CRM-M-1340-2011, directed the trial Court to adjourn the case beyond the date fixed by the High Court and the interim order was continued, thus exempting appearance of accused No. 3 to 8 before the trial Court except as and when required. It was thus reported by the District Judge, Hisar, that in view of the said circumstances, the matter could not be proceeded further by the trial Court as appearance of respondents No. 3 to 8 had already been exempted while summoning order against accused No.1 and 2 had been set aside by the Court. It was on the said fact while drawn that the application had been moved by the complainant before the SDJM for issuance of warrants of arrest, which

were dismissed by the trial Court and the reference was sent. The District Judge also submitted in his report that scandalous allegations had been levelled by the complainant against the integrity of Judges of the High Court as well as the Judicial Officers posted in the District and Sub Division.

12. On receipt of the said report, initiation of criminal proceedings under the “Criminal Contempt of Court” were approved and the matter was fixed before the Court.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE HIGH COURT IN THE CONTEMPT

13. Notice of motion was thereafter issued on 21.02.2022. The respondent-Contemnor entered appearance through an Advocate. The matter was taken up on various occasions to afford the respondent-contemnor an opportunity to file his response to the notice of contempt. In compliance thereof, the respondent-contemnor, however, filed his written arguments, which have been taken on record vide order dated 11.05.2026.

14. We have also pursued the interim orders passed in the present case and have noticed that the respondent had submitted that, being 81 years of age, he is suffering from various ailments. This Court suggested to the respondent-Contemnor that a Legal Aid Counsel could be provided to him; however, he declined the same and instead insisted on representing his case by himself. However, in the interest of justice, it was considered expedient to appoint Mr. Gurfateh Singh Khosa, Advocate, as an Amicus Curiae to assist this Court. It was also permitted that the respondent-contemnor may appear and give an undertaking to attend the proceedings through Video Conferencing mode.

15. On the date of hearing on 05.08.2026, the respondent-contemnor joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing and reiterated that he has already placed on record his written arguments and the same should be treated as his oral assertion and he has no other argument to raise. He has not denied either the legal notice or contempt thereof and instead owned the same and reiterated the contents thereof.

16. Learned Amicus Curiae was also requested to submit a synopsis of the case along with his submissions. The hearing was accordingly deferred to 07.08.2026, on which date the respondent-Contemnor appeared through Video Conferencing and reiterated the allegations already levelled in the legal notice and communication and also that there is no separate requirement for addressing oral arguments and that the written arguments submitted by him be treated as his submissions in the present case. The case was thus reserved for orders.

REPLY(IES) & WRITTEN ARGUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CONTEMNOR-RESPONDENT.

17. The replies and the responses filed by respondent-contemnor have been perused. The relevant and material extract of the reply submitted by the respondent-Contemnor reads thus: -

“5. That humble request of the Respondent to Your Honour is that Please decide this Contempt case urgently expeditiously as in it there is involvement of Ex M.L.A and Minister INLD Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal S/o Sh. Mittar Sain Goyal, Delhi Gate, Hansi Mob. No. 9812055610 as Accused No. 2 in the Complaint of Respondent Comi/496/2013/445-1/2007 for whom Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi has recommended Contempt proceedings against Respondent for attaching Unreplied Show Cause Notice

Dated 22.4.2019 (Annexure 1 attached with the Notice) in the Application Dated 8.8.2019 where in there is mention of Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018 (Annexure 2 Page 36-49) and Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 4.2.2019 (Annexure 3 Page 50-52) where in on 16.8.2018 EX. M.L.A had filed Calandra u/s 182 No. CHI/478/2018 (Annexure 4 Page 53) attaching with it Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018 (Annexure 2 Page 36-49) with charge of involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges by Ex. M.L.A and Ms. Nisha on 16.8.2018 while issuing Charge Sheet / Notice (Annexure 5 Page 53) to the Respondent not recommended Contempt proceedings against the Ex. M.L.A or against the Respondent (in the Hon'ble High Court) And Ex. M.L.A NOT appeared for the evidence in Calandra to challenge / deny the charges of Annexure 1, Annexure 2 and Annexure 3 for 3 years and the Ld. Trial Court in the decision of Calandra Dated 2.3.2022 (Annexure 6 Page 54-59) declared all the information / charge of Annexure 2 correct not proved false by the prosecution . Not only the Ld. Court on 2.3.2022 (Annexure 6 Page 54-59) found all these charges correct but Ex. M.L.A with his Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal not denied the Charges of Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 25.11.2019 (Annexure 7 Page 60-61), Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 2.12.2019 (Annexure 8 Page 62-65) while the Ex. M.L.A admitted all the charges of all these Unreplied Show Cause Notices (Annexure Nos.1,2,3,7and 8) in Unreplied Admission letter by way of Show Cause Notice Dated 5.9.2022 / 19.9.2022 (Annexure 9 Page 66-72). Thus Ex. M.L.A NOT denied any charge in the Police, in the Ld. Calandra Courts , but to defend / save Ex. MLA from the Police action or Hon'ble Judicial Action Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M first charge sheeted the Respondent in Calandra and afterwards recommend these contempt proceedings against the Respondent so that the Hon'ble Judiciary may take action against the Respondent and not against the Ex. M.L.A or the Hon'ble Judges whom Ex. M.L.A has

involved if the Hon'ble High Court not issues Notices to all the named Hon'ble Judges in these Notices (Annexure1, Annexure 2, Annexure 3, Annexure 7, Annexure 8 and Annexure 9) and asks the Respondent for unconditional apology.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

B) They recognized the Respondent at Chabra Chowk it means they were among those pistoldhari gundas who came to his house earlier to threaten him to life on behalf of Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal saying that no Police officer and the Hon'ble Judge at Hansi, at Hisar and even at Hon'ble High Court at Chandigarh is out of approach of Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal Ex. M.L.A and the Police will not register your any FIR against Ex. M.L.A and No Hon'ble Judge will decide any case against Ex. M.L.A.

D) If they are arrested and interrogated along with Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal they may help the Police to recover the pistols distributed by Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal, that may be more than 50 owned by more than 50 gundas, in stopping/checking crimes in Haryana and repeatedly threatening the Respondent to life with defaming the Hon'ble Judges being involved by Ex. M.L.A.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

16.11 That in the 4 cases the Hon'ble Judges decided the cases against the Respondent treating the forged deed Dated 5.10.1988 (Annexure 16 Page 89-90) with crossed signatures on its face a genuine Document and the Hon'ble Judges at this Hon'ble Court exempted the appearance of the Accuseds without once appearing in the Ld. Trial Court and without submitting bail bonds and Surety Bonds in the Ld. Trial Court.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

16.14 That Ex. M.L.A can be disclosed to the public, to the Police, to the Hon'ble Judiciary and this Notice will be a prove against him if he eliminated the Respondent.

17. That The Facts And Orders which should be considered to judge the behaviour of Ms.Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi.

17.1) That on 6.8.2018 Ex. M.L.A in his Application (Annexure 20 Page 98) addressed to the SP HANSI wrote to him to take action against Ram Niwas Agrawal for attacking on his character but not writes about the charge of murder of Sh. Vinod S/o Sh. Ram Kumar Budanawala written in Para 3(f) of 21.1.2018 (Annexure 2 Page 36-49) in which his character was attacked . He neither mentions the charges of his more than 15 unbailable crimes and nor the charges of his involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges levelled in this Annexure 2 Page 36-49.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

17.3 It is cognizable that on 16.8.2018 Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi not informed this Hon'ble High Court about the charges of involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges by Ex. M.L.A. Why not She recorded a Statement of Ex. M.L.A for denial of his (Ex. M.L.A) involving 5 Hon'ble Judges to inform this Hon'ble Court. At that time Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M not passed any order for starting any contempt against the Respondent as She was to defend Ex. M.L.A from the Police action and registering of FIR for his (Ex M.L.A) more than 15 unbailable crimes mentioned in Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018 (Annexure 2 Page 36-49).

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

B) Requested the Ld. Court that as Ex. M.L.A has attached Annexure 2 Page 36 in which in its Para 2 there is mention of his involving the Hon'ble Judges. This is not with in the Jurisdiction of this Ld. Court hence this Annexure 2 Page 36 -49 be sent to Hon'ble High Court for necessary action.

C) In this Calandra no Statement of Ex. M.L.A has been attached with his denial of any charge means all the charges are true including the involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

17.12 On 24.11.2019 In evening Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal sent his pistoldhari Gunda using forged No. 6273 on his car to threaten the Respondent to life using Defamatory Allegations on Ms. Nisha the Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi that milk bill of Ms. Nisha is paid by Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal through his Advocate Parveen Mittal As her milk man supplies milk to Parveen Mittal also if the pistoldhari gunda eliminated the Respondent then The Judge would save Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal Ex. M.L.A and the pistoldhari gunda.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

17.14 On 17.11.2020 (after one year) the Respondent submitted his Application Dated 17.11.2020 (Annexure 30 Page 116-118) in the Ld. Court for speedy hearing in Calandra to Register his FIRs to save his life attaching with it Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 25.11.2019 (Annexure 7 Page 60-61) issued to Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal and Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 2.12.2019 issued to Sh. Parveen Mittal Advocate (Annexure 8 Page 62-65) and requested Ms. Nisha the Ld. S.D.J.M.

A) To issue Notices to Ex. M.L.A, his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal, Milk man of Sh. Parveen Mittal through Sh. Parveen Mittal and the pistoldhari gunda of Ex M.L.A using forged number of 6273 of motor cycle on his car through Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal (Ex. M.L.A) for defaming the Hon'ble Court of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi that her milk bill is paid by Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal through Sh. Parveen Mittal. While threatening the Respondent to life as for 1 year Ex. M.L.A and Sh. Parveen Mittal not challenged these charges in this Ld. Court by appearing for the evidence in Calandra CHI/478/2018 inspite of repeated Notices to them.

B) The Respondent further requested the Ld. Court of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M to issue bailable warrants to Ex. M.L.A to appear for evidence in Calandra with his pistoldhari Gunda using forged number 6273 of motor cycle on his car otherwise

order the Police to Register a FIR against Ex. M.L.A and his pistoldhari Gunda and his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal for defaming the Ld. Court.

C) The Respondent further requested the Ld. Court to send a report to the Hon'ble this Court requesting it to start contempt proceedings against Ex. M.L.A and his lawyer for defaming the Ld. Court of Ms. Nisha through a publice person the pistoldhari gunda of Ex. M.L.A.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

D) That Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi took no action against Ex. M.L.A and his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal Instead She passed the orders Dated 18.11.2020 (Annexure 31 Page 119) for the transfer of second file of the Respondent of Calandra No. CHI/478/2018 to other Ld. Court started by Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M herself on 16.8.2018.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

2. And without taking any permission from this Hon'ble High Court to investigate the charges against 5 Hon'ble Judges. It was Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal who handed over Hand written copy of Annexure 2 Page 36-49 to SHO and DSP and they attached it with Calandra.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

18.3 Please consider the fact that even after this Annexure 3 Ex. M.L.A and his lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal not came for the evidence in Calandra to deny the fresh charge of involving Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M with them and to prove false the other charges including the involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges.

19. The reasons compelled the Respondent to issue Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 22.4.2019 Annexure 1 to the Ex. M.L.A attached with the Notice.

19.1 That brother of Sh. Ramendra Jain (Ld. Advocate) Sh. Shalendra Jain admitted to the Respondent that Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal Ex M.L.A as a Minister of Local body had obliged their family when refusing to take case of Respondent against Ex.

M.L.A. This fact the Respondent wrote in Para 16(B) of this Notice Annexure 1 attached with Notice.

19.2 Late Sh. Kulbhushan Jain Advocate when the Respondent named him in Annexure 2 Page 36-49 (Para3-0) for demanding phiroti of Rs. 5 Lakh from Sh. Bhushan Jain Financer for Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal threatened the Respondent that the Respondent could not stop Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal to eliminate the Respondent by his pistoldhari gundas as Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain is a close friend of Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal and they can be seen in meetings in Dr. N.D. Gupta Hospital, at 262 , Model Town, Hisar on Sundays.

19.3 That when Mr. Justice Sh.Ramendra Jain is a close friend of Sh.Subhash Chand Goyal then legally he was not supposed to keep the file of Case No. CRM-M-1340 Of 2011 with him from 11.7.2018 to 4.4.2019.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

19.5 It is cognizable that even knowing the fact of close friendship of Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain with Ex. M.L.A the Respondent never approached Hon'ble Chief Justice of Hon'ble High Court for transfer of file of his case CRM-M-1340 Of 2011 from him. This is another proof for his respect for Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain as a Hon'ble Judge as for all the Hon'ble Judges. The Respondent not used any Defamatory language against him in the Ld.Court. He only pointed out the Law points for his illegal orders.

19.6 Their friendship is of give and take started during the Ministership of Ex. M.L.A for resolving disputes of big properties owned by Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

19.12 That on 4.4.2019 in non maintainable Petition CRM-M 11243 of 2019 in CRM-M-1340 of 2011 Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain stayed the Proceedings up to 1.8.2019 vide order Dated 4.4.2019 (Annexure 36 Page 124).

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

19.14 Then to stop Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain to pass any further order Against the Respondent the Respondent issued Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 22.4.2019 (Annexure 1 attached with Notice) to all the Accuseds and other Respondents to collect proves against him and other Accuseds.

19.15 As illegal orders of Stay of Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain ruined Four lives of members of family of Respondent by delaying the Decision of his Complaint giving chance to pistoldhari gundas to Eliminate the Respondent and Torture his whole family.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

20.2 That while attaching Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 22.4.2019 with the Application Dated 8.8.2019 was to persuade Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M to start the proceedings as Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain had passed Stay Orders out of Law as explained above And involvement of Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain with them has not been denied by the Accuseds and other Respondents of Annexure 1 attached with Notice.

20.3 That when in its orders Dated 1.8.2019 (Annexure 38 Page 125) Hon'ble this High Court confirmed that in orders Dated 4.4.2019 (Annexure 36 Page 124) proceedings were stayed illegally when in these Orders no number of CRM-M 11243 of 2019 in CRM-M 1340 of 2011 was mentioned with the numbers of all the other Four petitions that of 202(1)CRM-M 1340 of 2011, 202(2)CRM-M 2166 of 2011, 202(3) CRM-M 32658 of 2011 and 202 (4) CRM-M 22825 of 2012.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

21. That Your Honours may Please consider the following grounds when the Hon'ble Judicials are defaming the Hon'ble Judiciary themselves while the Respondent is defending the defamation of Hon'ble Judiciary:-

A) That in two Summoning Orders the offence is of running the petrol pump on the basis of Alleged Deed Dated 5.10.1988 Ex. P24 (Annexure 16 Page 89-90) while the crossed signatures on

its face prove it forged, who so ever sees this Deed Comments that the Hon'ble trial Court and Hon'ble High Court in 13 years could not decide this deed being forged while a lay man can easily decide it to be forged seeing with naked eyes. Respondent remain mum at that time.

B) That when the Ld. Trial Court announces that he is waiting for the orders of the Hon'ble High Court then the gathering comments that the Hon'ble High Court and the Ld. Trial Court will not decide the case untill the Ex. M.L.A eliminate the Respondent.

C) That when Ld. Court started the proceedings following the orders Dated 28.3.2018 of Breaking Stay of Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Hon'ble High Court stayed the proceedings then the gathering only defamed the Hon'ble Courts.

D) That when the Stay is vacated after six months which has been reiterated by Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order 4.11.2020 in Ashwini Kumar Upadhaya Vs Union of India and Anr. Two Ld. Courts not follow it then it is defaming the Hon'ble Judiciary in the gatherings.

E) That when three Ld. Courts not started day to day hearing on the involvement of Ex. M.L.A following the Hon'ble Supreme Court Order Dated 4.12.2018 in Sh. Ashwani Kumar Upadhaya Petition in the gathering it is defaming the Hon'ble Judiciary.

F) That when in the public place two pistoldhari gundas threatened the Respondent to life and Police not registered FIR and when 1st Ld. Court not passed orders u/s 156-3 (Annexure 28 Page 113) and the other Ld. Court dismissed the Private complaint No. Comi/86/2020 vide order Dated 17.11.2021 (Annexure 39 Page 126). It defamed the Hon'ble Courts.

G) That when in the complaint u/s 420,467,468,471,120-B/218 and 506 the Accuseds not appeared for 7 years ie two Hon'ble Courts not decided this complaint for more than 7 years the Ld. Trial Court charge sheeted the Respondent in false Calandra on the application of Ex. M.L.A the gathering badly

commented that in such offence the Hon'ble Court are obeying the Criminal (Ex. M.L.A) And punishing the Aggrieved (Respondent) then for what the Hon'ble Courts have been established as guardians of the Constitution.

H) That a book can be written on such comments in last 12 years.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

c. That then Ex. M.L.A involved the Hon'ble Judiciary for not deciding non maintainable Petitions of the Accuseds at Hon'ble High Court illegally passing exemption of appearance orders without once appearing, without submitting bail bonds and Surety Bonds in the Ld. Trial Courts and even Stay Orders even on the involvement of Ex M.L.A and the Ld. Trial Court not starting the proceedings violating the Hon'ble Supreme Court orders and of Hon'ble High Court orders against the Fundamental rights of the Complainant / Respondent.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

23.1 Mrs. Justice Nirmal Jit Kaur vide order Dated 17.1.2011 (Annexure 11 Page 74) exempted the appearance of Accuseds in the Ld. Trial Court Except as and when required. <u>This Hon'ble Court is humbly requested to decide the legal point in passing of these orders that

A) Whether the letter Dated 25.4.1994 (Annexure 47 attached with Notice/ Petition at Page 30-31) written to The Chief Divisional Manager, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Delhi Division, Delhi could be treated as a complaint filed in 1994 in which names of present petitioners not included as Accuseds.

B) Whether Hon'ble High Court could exempt the appearance of Accuseds in the Ld. Trial Court, without once appearing and submitting any bail bond and without submitting any Surety Bond.

1) Whether her these orders resulted in to Staying the proceedings till this date as proceedings could not be started

without the statement of Accuseds that the Evidence / Statement of Complainant made before their lawyer would be acceptable to them in their absence.

2) Whether any relief (exemption of appearance) can be granted to the petitioners in the Non maintainable Petitions twice on 17.1.2011 and 25.1.2011.

C) Whether She proved involved by Ex. M.L.A

1) When Ex. M.L.A admitted her involvement in Annexure 9 and not denied her involvement in the Ld. Court of Calandra.

2) When in Annexure 6 Ld. Court held that No Charge proved false.

3) Whether She should deny the charge and explain legality of her orders.

4) Whether her order allowed the Ex. M.L.A thefts of Public money by way of pension.

5) Whether her orders could be resulted in eliminated the Respondent at any time.

6) For the crimes of Ex. M.L.A Hansi has to be made a Police District.

23.2 Mr. Justice K.C.PURI As written in the Para 4 of the Notice and Annexure 13 Page 78 above

A) Whether he could Accept Third non maintainable Petition and pass illegal exemption orders in such Petition.

B) Whether he was not to issue Notice to the opposite lawyer of the Respondent.

C) Whether he passed contradictory orders of the interim orders (Annexure 11 Page 74).

D) For what he quoted half of the Interim Orders in his order.

E) Whether he had passed such illegal orders which set aside the legal orders of Ld. Court Dated 22.9.2011 (Annexure 12 Page 75-77) in unbailable crimes.

F) His orders resulted in staying the proceedings till this date.

G) *His orders allowed all the Accuseds including Ex. M.L.A big thefts of public money as salary and pension and to continue his unbailable crimes till this date.*

H) *Whether he should deny his involvement and explain legality of his orders.*

23.3 Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain

A) *Whether he could kept case file of CRM-M-1340 Of 2011 and it's connected files with him w.e.f 11.7.2018 to 4.4.2019 when EX.M.L.A was his close friend as explained in Para 19.1.*

B) *Whether he was not to decide these Petitions urgently on involvement of Ex. M.L.A obeying the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court or he was to return these files to the Hon'ble Chief Justice to be decided in Special Bench.*

C) *For what he passed illegal Stay Orders in non maintainable Petition CRM-M 11243 of 2019 in CRM-M 1340 of 2011.*

D) *For what he not issued Notice to the opposite lawyer.*

E) *For what he Stayed the proceedings against the interim orders and against the Hon'ble Supreme Court orders of Breaking Stay Dated 28.3.2018.*

F) *Whether his orders resulted in big theft of public money by the Accuseds including Ex. M.L.A allowing him to continue his non bailable crimes and charging phiroties through pistoldhari gundas who can eliminate the Respondent at any time.*

G) *His involvement not denied/ challenged in the Ld. Court of Calandra and Ex. M.L.A has admitted in Annexure 9.*

23.4 Mrs. Justice Jaishree Thakur:- *Her orders in CRM-M 52902 of 2021 Dated 20.12.2021 (Annexure 41 Page 130-131) have been passed ignoring following Legal points:-*

A) *That She has illegally stays the proceedings in non maintainable Petition of Accuseds whose earlier Petition CRM-M-1340 Of 2011 are under consideration of Hon'ble High Court where in No Stay in the Interim orders as declared by Hon'ble High Court in Annexure 10.*

B) That these orders are against the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court Dated 28.3.2018, 4.12.2018 and 4.11.2020 where in on involvement of Ex M.L.A Petitions should be decided urgently in day to day basis without any break and not allowing any adjournment.

C) That orders have been passed without issuing any Notice to the opposite lawyer.

D) Her orders resulted in big thefts of Public money charging as salary and pension by the Accuseds including Ex. M.L.A allowing him to continue his unbailable crimes and charging phiroties through pistoldhari gundas who can eliminate the Respondent at any time.

E) When the Petitions against 1st Summoning order Dated 2.11.2010 were not decided for ten years her orders Stayed the proceedings further for more than two years till this date which is big injustice with the Aggrieved / Respondent snatching his Fundamental Rights.

23.5 Sh. Ashwani Kumar Goyal the then Ld. S.D.J.MA)

A) In dismissing Complaint No. 445-1 of 2007 he treated the Forged Deed with Crossed Signatures Ex P 24 (Annexure 16 Page 89-90) a genuine Document.

B) His involvement not denied by Ex. M.L.A in Ld. Court of Calandra mentioned in Annexure 2 and Ex. M.L.A admitted his involvement in Annexure 9. And Ld. Court of Calandra found this information/charge on him correct in Annexure 6.

C) His orders resulted in big thefts of Public money charged as Salary and pension by the Accuseds including Ex M.L.A allowing Ex. M.L.A to continue his non bailable crimes and charging phiroties through his pistoldhari gundas who may eliminate the Respondent at any time.

D) His orders resulted in ruining the whole family of the Respondent.

E) Natural Justice requires his denial of charges and explanations of his orders who has been declared guilty by Ld. Court of Calandra.

23.6 Ms. Shikha Yadav, the then Ld. A.C.J.(Sr.Div.) Hansi:-*In her case the Sub Paras (A),(B),(C),(D) and (E) of Para 23.5 written above apply as it is.*

(F) She removed "Written Arguments" Dated 18.3.2015 from the Court file as per certificate on Certified copy form (Annexure 42 Page 132-133).

(G) She ignored the admission of forgery by the BPCL in its letter dated 25.1.2011 (Annexure 43 Page 134-143) in Para 8 and 14.

(H) Even on admission of forgery She snatched Petrol pump of the Respondent.

23.7 Ms. Ritu Tagore the then Ld. A.S.J. Hisar.

In her case also the Sub Paras A, B, C, D and E of Para 23.5 written above apply as it is.

(F) She removed "Written Reply to Written Submission on behalf of the Revisionist Accuseds," (Submitted by the Respondent) from the case file.

(G) Her order resulted in Staying the proceedings in the Ld. Trial Court till this date.

23.8 Sh. Jai Bir Singh the then Ld. Additional District Judge, Hisar:-

In his case also the Sub Paras (A),(B),(C),(D) and (E) of Para 23.5 Written above apply as it is.

(F) Surprisingly in his order he declares that the signatures obtained on gun point on 8.4.1987 on a Single, Simple, Plane White paper can appear on the two Stamp papers of later Date of 5.10.1988.

In his case also the Sub Paras (G) and (H) of 23.6 written above apply.

23.9 Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi passed the orders Dated 8.8.2019 (Annexure 44 , 1st order Page 144-145 and 2nd order attached with the Notice).

A) That following Hon'ble Supreme Court Order Dated 28.3.2018 of Breaking Stay and order Dated 4.12.2018 of Starting day to hearing on involvement of Ex. M.L.A why She not issued Notices to all the Accuseds for starting the proceedings after these dates.

B) That when following the order Dated 28.3.2018 of Breaking Stay She issued Notices to all the Accuseds on 20.2.2019 (Annexure 33), on 28.3.2019 (Annexure 34), on 2.4.2019 ((Annexure 35), then why not She issued warrants to all the Accuseds when they did not appear in the Ld. Court on the fixed dates.

C) That why She dismissed my Application 8.8.2019 (Annexure 44 Page 144-145) for starting the proceedings when the Stay of proceedings Dated 4.4.2019 (Annexure 36 Page 124) was not continued by the Hon'ble High Court in its order Dated 1.8.2019 (Annexure 38 Page 125).

D) That when She passed order for Contempt Proceedings on attaching of Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 22.4.2019 Annexure 1 with the Application 8.8.2019 why not She recommended Contempt proceedings against the Ex. M.L.A or the Respondent on mention of involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges in Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018 (Annexure 2) before issuing the Notice of Calandra to the Respondent on 16.8.2018 per (Annexure 4 Page 53).

E) That when in Calandra written and oral arguments were Advanced on 26.10.2018 then why She denied the Advancement of arguments in the order Dated 26.10.2018 (Annexure 21)

F) That why She denied Advancement of Arguments on next three dates ie on 13.11.2018 (Annexure 22), on 29.11.2018 (Annexure 23) and 17.12.2018 (Annexure 24).

G) That Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M admitted Advancement of Arguments on 19.12.2018 (Annexure 26) while the prove of Advancement of Arguments on 26.10.2018 is Certificate Dated

18.12.2018 of issuing Certified Copy of Written Arguments on 26.10.2018 (Annexure 25).

H) That when She Charge Sheeted the Respondent on 8.1.2019 (Annexure 27) after 5 months of filing Calandra on 16.8.2018 then to linger on the decision She not issued warrants to the prosecution for appearing for evidence for hearing on day to day basis on involvement of Ex. M.L.A.

I) That why She not ordered the Police to Register FIR u/s 156-3 in Criminal Complaint Comi/86/2020 in her orders Dated 22.12.2020 (Annexure 28) when the Ex. M.L.A was not coming for evidence in Calandra for denial of charges levelled in the Complaint Comi 86/2020.

J) That why She transferred the file of case Comi/496/13/445-1/2007 to other Court on 23.11.2019 (Annexure 29) when the Respondent requested her to start day to day trial on involvement of Ex. M.L.A producing Hon'ble High Court order Dated 16.10.2019 (Annexure 10 Page 73) for no Stay on proceedings.

K) That why She took no Judicial or Police action on Ex. MLA and his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal when the Respondent submitted in her Court the Application Dated 17.11.2020 (Annexure 30) attaching with it Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 25.11.2019 (Annexure 7) and Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 2.12.2019 (Annexure 8) in which her sanctity was challenged with charge on her that her milk bill was paid by Ex. M.L.A through his lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal.

L) That why She kept mum and transferred the file of Calandra (Started by herself) to other Court vide order Dated 18.11.2020 (Annexure 31)

M) That why She not transferred this second file on 23.11.2019 to other Court when She transferred the Case file Comi/496/2013/445-1/2007 (Annexure 29 Page 114-115). This is self explanatory prove that at that time She wanted to defend the Ex. M.L.A from the Judicial and Police action.

23.10 Sh. Manjeet Pal Ld. J.M.F.C , Hansi on 2.3.2022

A) That when Hon'ble High Court vide order Dated 16.10.2019 (Annexure 10 Page 73) cleared that there was no Stay in these Petitions and asked to Start proceedings then why not he Started day to day trial on involvement of Ex. M.L.A as per directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

B) That when Hon'ble High Court in its order Dated 24.7.2013 (Annexure 18 Page 96) passed the order that there was no need to consider afresh the evidence and attached the Petition No. CRM-M 22825 of 2012 with the main Petition CRM-M-1340 Of 2011. Thus Hon'ble High Court again declared Accuseds to Accused no. 1 Accused no. 2 Ex. M.L.A then why not Ld. J.M.F.C issued notices to Ex. M.L.A to appear for day to day trial.

C) That when Hon'ble High Court in (Annexure 18 Page 96) written above denied to consider afresh as passed in Ld. A.S.J order Dated 31.5.2012 then for what he passed second Summoning Orders Dated 19.10.2021(Annexure 45 Page 146-149) considering afresh.

D) That when Ld. J.M.F.C considered afresh following the orders Dated 31.5.2012 of the Ld. A.S.J filed by Accused No. 1 and Accused No. 2 Ex. M.L.A then for what on top of the Summoning order dated 19.10.2021 (Annexure 45 Page 146-149) he wrote that Accused No.1 and 2 released by Ld. A.S.J on 31.5.2012.

E) That when in order Dated 19.10.2021 (Annexure 45 Page 146-149) Ld. J.M.F.C redeclared Accused to Ex. M.L.A then for what he not issued Notice to him to appear for the trial.

F) That when Ld. J.M.F.C passed Summoning order dated 19.10.2021 (Annexure 45 Page 146-149) then for what he not started the proceedings instead on 17.11.2021 he mentioned in the order (Annexure 46 Page 150)that he was waiting for the Hon'ble High Court orders in the Revision to be filed by Accused No. 3 to 8 . As if it was in his knowledge that these Accuseds would file a Revision No. CRM-M 52902 of 2021 in which proceedings would be Stayed. This fact is self explanatory prove

of his considering afresh was only to provide chance to the Accuseds to obtain Stay Orders against the procedure and out of law.

G) That why he not Started day to day hearing in Calandra on involvement of Ex. M.L.A as per directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

H) That when he saw that Ex. M.L.A, DSP Sh. Narender Singh Kadyan and S.H.O. Sh. Uday Bhan Godara in their evidence not denied the involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges by Ex. M.L.A then why not Ld. J.M.F.C recommended Contempt proceedings against them to the Hon'ble High Court.

I) That Ld. J.M.F.C in Calandra saw that Ex. M.L.A is not coming for evidence in Calandra without issuing warrants to deny the charges on him of distributing pistols in wholesome in the gundas of village Sisai and repeatedly using them for threatening to life to the Respondent, for murders, firings, compelling people to leave Hansi, for big thefts and phiroties as explained above then why he dismissed private complaint Comi/86 /2020 of the Respondent vide order Dated 17.11.2021 (Annexure 39 Page 126).

J) That why he not took any Judicial or Police action on the Ex. M.L.A for filing false Calandra in Criminal Conspiracy with the Police officers and on these two Police officers.”

18. It is also pertinent to submit that the respondent-Contemnor submitted an additional reply dated 04.11.2024. The extract reflecting continued contumacious response reads thus: -

1. That Your Honour is humbly requested to read and include the two attached Affidavits Dated 4.11.2024 (Annexure 1) and the Affidavit Dated 9.12.2024, the Speed Post delivered on 16.12.2024 (Annexure 2) against Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi

on 16.8.2018 for her involvement by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal.

2. That the self explanatory prove of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M being involved by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal are as below:-

3. That only by payment of her monthly milk bills by Ex M.L.A She wants to save / defend Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal for his admittedly offences of distributing pistols in the gundas of village Sisai and using them in repeatedly threatening to life to the Applicant at public places and at his residence H.No.55, Model Town Hansi for leaving the Hansi and for leaving his petrol pump M/s Haryana Auto Service-ODD-948 G.T Road, Hansi and in other offences detailed in the reply.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

5. That when She saw that Ex M.L.A is not in the position to deny the charges on Ex M.L.A as explained in the Reply Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M to pressurize the applicant for not to file any Application or file an Affidavit against her in the Hon'ble High Court Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M filed the contempt proceedings against the applicant diverting the applicant to try to save himself instead of disclosing Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M and Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal before this Hon'ble High Court.

6. That She forgot that her involvement by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal who is responsible for murders, for charging phiroties, by firings, for big thefts, trying repeatedly to eliminate the Applicant by his pistoldhari gundas, is more dangerous than the so called charge of contempt u/s CROCP -1-2022.

7. That in addition to the two Annexures 1 and Annexure 2 the applicant has sent similar Affidavits against the other 7 Hon'ble Judges to the Hon'ble High Court and to the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the Hon'ble High Court For the States of Punjab and Haryana At Chandigarh for the quick action on all of these Hon'ble members of Hon'ble Judiciary with a humble request to

Your Honours to stop these Hon'ble Judges urgently to not to further ruin the people by their decisions And to order the Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi to start immediately day to day proceedings in my Complaint No. 445-1 of 24.12.2007/ Comi/496/2013 calling all the Accuseds to decide it with in two to three months on the involvement of Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal as Accused No. 2.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

11. That why not She passed contempt orders against Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal when in Annexure no. 23 (attached in Annexure 1 here) the Applicant attaching with this Annexure 23 , Annexure No. 21, Annexure No. 22 the Applicant asked Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M to explain whether her monthly milk bill is paid by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal through his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal as milkman of Sh. Parveen Mittal also supplies milk to Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M. This charge on her was explained to me by the pistoldhari gunda of Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal on 24.11.2019 explained in Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 25.11.2019 (Annexure 21) and this charge is not being denied by Ex. M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal and his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal by appearing for their evidence in Calandra No. CHI-478-2018 for which they were not appearing in her Ld. Court of Calandra till that time. This fact is self explanatory prove of involvement of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M with Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal.

12. That when on mention of on involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges in the Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018 (Annexure 4 in Annexure 1 here) , mention of involvement of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M herself in the Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 25.11.2019 (Annexure 21 in Annexure 1 here) and in the Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 2.12.2019 (Annexure 22 in Annexure 1 here) then Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Should be asked how the mention of involvement of Mr. Justice Sh. Ramendra Jain

in the Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 22.4.2019 (Attached with the Court Notice) to 28 Respondents including all the Accuseds and Expected Accuseds in my Complaint No. 445-1 of 24.12.2007/Comi/496/2013 was a Contempt of Court. While this charge was not denied by any of the Respondent including Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal.

WRITTEN ARGUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CONTEMNOR-RESPONDENT

19. Written argument, accompanied by the affidavit dated 17.03.2025, were also sent by the respondent-Contemnor to place on record additional material/additional information. The brazen baseless and absurd plea raised therein read thus: -

11. Yours Honours are humbly requested to consider to dismiss Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M when on 16.8.2018 while filing a false Calandra No. CHI-478-2018 on the application of Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal, the DSP Sh. Narender Singh Kadyan and SHO Sh. Uday Bhan Godara attached as Annexure 2(in the reply with Affidavit Dated 5.2.2024). In this Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018 in the Para 2nd there is mention of involvement of 5 Hon'ble Judges Namely Mrs. Justice Nirmal Jit Kaur, Sh. Ashwani Kumar Goyal the then Ld. S.D.J.M, Mrs. Ritu Tagore the then Ld. ASJ, Mrs. Shikha Yadav the then ACJ (Sr. Div.) And Sh. Jai Bir Singh Hudda the then ADJ by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal.

12. That there was mention of 5 Hon'ble Judges including one Hon'ble Judge of Hon'ble High Court Mrs. Justice Nirmal Jit Kaur in the Show Cause Notice Issued to Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal.

13. That if the mention of involvement of Judges in the Show Cause Notice to accuseds was a Contempt of Hon'ble Court then

at that time inspite of verbal arguments by Respondent, why not Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M recommended such Contempt proceedings on 16.8.2018.

14. When Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M not recommended Contempt proceedings on 16.8.2018 on mention of involvement of Hon'ble Judges in Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018.

15. Then for what Ms. Nisha Ld S.D.J.M recommended Contempt proceedings against the Respondent on mention of involvement of Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain in addition to above Hon'ble Judges in the Show Cause Notice Issued by Respondent to accuseds and Respondents Dated 22.4.2019.

16. That her second different Decisions are on 23.11.2019 then in Annexure 29 (with Affidavit Dated 5.2.2024) in her orders Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M on not having faith on her She transfers my case file Criminal Complaint No. Comi/496/2013 to other Ld. Court that time why She not transferred the file of other case the Calandra CHI-478-2018 to other Ld. Court.

17. That at that time Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M was to defend Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal who could be issued warrants by other Courts to declare false the Calandra filed against procedure and against law.

18. That the third chance of different decision is in her order Dated 18.11.2020 in CHI-478-2018 Annexure 31 (in the reply with Affidavit Dated 5.2.2024) in this order Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M transfers the case file of this case to other Ld. Court on the Application 17/18.11.2020 Annexure 30(in the reply with Affidavit Dated 5.2.2024) with which are attached Annexure 7 (in the reply with Affidavit Dated 5.2.2024) and Annexure 8 (in the reply with Affidavit Dated 5.2.2024) . In these Show Cause Notices Dated 25.11.2019 to Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal and in Show Cause Notice Dated 2.12.2019 to Sh. Parveen Mittal Ld. Advocate for Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal there is mention of disclosure by a public person the pistoldhari gunda

of Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal that the milk bill of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M is paid by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal through his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal. Then on attacking on her (which She not denied herself) Why not Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M not recommended Contempt proceedings against Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal and his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal on 18.11.2020.

20. Thereafter, another set of written arguments was also furnished by the complaint, dated 30.04.2026. The scandalous extract of the same reads thus: -

4. That I requested my Ld. Lawyer to request Your Honour that the long journey from Hansi to Chandigarh and back to Hansi may prove fatal for me as my cousin Vipin Kumar having good health died on 29.3.2026 when he did long journey from Ambikapur (Chhattisgarh) to and from Nagpur (Maharashtra).

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

6. That in compelling me to appear in your Hon'ble Court on 11.5.2026 you have ignored and contempting the following orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

8. That if your Honour not exempt my appearance on 11.5.2026 and convey and confirm your order to me by message to me on my phone no. 93061-32234 and Email ramniwasagarwal27@gmail.com before 10.5.2026 then taking risk on my life I will have to appear and read out the following facts in your Hon'ble open Court to save my life and the Police arrest on the order of admitted corrupt Judge Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

10. That as per order Dated 4.12.2018 and repeated order Dated 16.9.2020 in Writ Petition (Civil) no. 699/2016 on the involvement of Ex M.L.A (here Accused No. 2 Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal) Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M was to decide my Criminal Complaint Comi/496/2013 by day to day hearing allowing no adjournments before her charge sheeted me in false Calandra No. CHI-478-2018 filed by the SHO a junior officer to the SP under Criminal Conspiracy with Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal and DSP Narender Singh Kadyan City Police Station Hansi.

11. That similarly on involvement of Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal Ms. Nisha was to decide this Calandra CHI-478-2018 by day to day hearing within two to three months in 2018 I.e. 8 months earlier to 8.8.2019 when She recommended Contempt proceedings against me for this present suit against me I am a whistle blower in proving corrupt to Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M for the sanctity of the Hon'ble Judiciary and for the public interest and for the welfare of the public.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

15. That the files of 8 Accuseds i.e. the petitions CRM-M-1340 of 2011 , CRM-M-2166 of 2011 and CRM-M 22825 of 2012 were with Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain from 11 July 2018 to 15.2.2019 for about 7 months it was in active knowledge of Sh. Ramendra Jain that in this there is involvement of Ex M.L.A and it was in my active knowledge that Sh. Ramendra Jain and Ex M.L.A Subhash Chand Goyal became close friends when as a Minister of local bodies Subhash Chand Goyal solved disputes of large ancestral properties owned by the family of Sh. Ramendra Jain. Even then I not submitted my Application before the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble High court to transfer the files of my case in the Special Court. While Court of Sh. Ramendra Jain was not a Special Court and contempting of orders of Hon'ble

Supreme Court Sh. Ramendra Jain not decided these cases in 7 months.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

17. That the following self explanatory proves of corruption of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi have been sent to this Hon'ble Court repeatedly but they are not seen by the Hon'ble Judges of this Hon'ble High Court. My humble request to Your Honour is to allow me to read out and show the documents to your Honours on 11.5.2026 to decide the corruption of Ms. Nisha in Your open Court.

(A) On 16.10.2019 (Annexure 3) Hon'ble High Court Order to demand the Report of Ld. Sessions and District Court Hisar on the progress of proceedings in my these criminal complaints as there was no Stay by Hon'ble High Court.

(B) Contempting this order Ms. Nisha on 23.11.2019 (Annexure 4) transferred my complaint file Comi/496/2013 to other Ld. Court.

(C) At that time She not transferred my other file of Calandra CHI-478-2018 to other Ld. Court to defend Ex M.L.A Subhash Chand Goyal.

(D) On 24.11.2019 two pistoldhari gundas of Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal came to my house and warned me that Constable to DGP would not register my F.I.R.

(E) That Ld. Trial Court at Hansi, District Courts at Hisar and the Hon'ble Courts at High Court Chandigarh will not decide any case against Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal, his pistoldhari gundas and his Ld. Lawyer Parveen Mittal.

(F) This was contempt of all the Hon'ble Courts by a public man the pistoldhari gundas of Ex M.L.A before their victims like me.

(G) They disclosed to me the reason of this that monthly milk bill of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M is paid by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand

Goyal through his Ld. Lawyer Parveen Mittal as the supplier of milk to Parveen Mittal also supplies milk to Ms. Nisha.

(H) That with this disclosure Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 25.11.2019 (Annexure 5) was Issued to Ex M.L.A by me.

(I) That similar Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 2.12.2019 was Issued to Sh. Parveen Mittal Ld. Lawyer of Ex M.L.A (Annexure 6).

(J) That after one year to save the sanctity of Hon'ble Judiciary an Application dated 17/18.11.2020 (Annexure 7) was submitted in the Ld. Court of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M.

(K) That Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal +his Advocate Sh. Parveen Mittal and Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M herself not denied the disclosure of Pistoldhari gunda that monthly milk bill of Ms. Nisha is paid by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal through his Advocate Sh. Parveen Mittal.

(L) That file of my second case of Calandra was also transferred to other Ld. Court vide order Dated 18.11.2020. (Annexure 8).

18 That requiring bailable warrants Ex M.L.A appeared in Ld. Court of Sh. Manjeet Pal Ld. J.M.F.C on 13.10.2021 and in his evidence Ex M.L.A not denied the following Criminal charges on him levelled on him in Unreplied Show Cause Notice Dated 21.1.2018 and the pamphlet (already in the contempt file) and in the Judicial enquiry in the decision of Calandra Dated 2.3.2022 these charges declared correct:-

(A) Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal distributed pistols in about 100 gundas of village Sisai during his Ministership in 2000 to 2005.

(B) He is using them in regular threatening me to life to me to leave petrol pump and to leave Hansi.

(C) On disclosure of his going to GB Road Ex M.L.A Sh Subhash Chand Goyal got murdered Vinod S/o Sh. Ram Kumar Budanawala on 30.3.2005.

(D) Ex M.L.A got murdered Devraj Lohia and one Chabra on denying phiroti to his pistoldhari gundas.

(E) Ex M.L.A got fired on Bhushan financer on denying phiroti of Rs. 5 lakhs through Kulbhushan Jain Advocate.

(F) Ex M.L.A compelled Hans Raj Lohia to leave Hansi when his brother gave supari of huge money to Ex M.L.A.

(G) Ex M.L.A got theft of about Rs. 2 crores at current price of Mukuts etc. In Shree Shyam Baba Mandir.

(H) Ex M.L.A sent 6 to 7 pistoldhari gundas for decoity in day time when daughter of Sh. Navin Kumar Jain was alone in his house in Model Town, Hansi.

(I) Ex M.L.A involved Mrs. Justice Nirmal Jit Kaur for exemption of appearance to accuseds no. 3 to 8 in two non maintainable Petitions CRM-M-1340 of 2011 and CRM-M-2166 of 2011.

(J) Ex M.L.A involved Sh. Ashwani Kumar Goyal for dismissing my Criminal Complaint 445-1 of 24.12.2007 u/s 420,467,468,471,120-B, 218,506 and 406 on 17.8.2009.

(K) Ex M.L.A involved Ms. Shikha Yadav Ld. S.D.J.M, Sh. Jai Bir Singh Ld. ASJ and Ms. Ritu Tagore Ld. A.S.J for deciding the cases in his favour.

19 That only on payment of monthly milk bill of Ms Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M in Criminal Conspiracy with Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal charge sheeted me in false and illegal Calandra filed by SHO Sh Uday Bhan Godara and DSP Narender Singh Kadyan City Police Station, Hansi both the officers junior to the SP.

20. That She wanted to linger on the registering of F.I.R on Ex M.L.A.

21. That on 16.8.2018 Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M Hansi not recommended the contempt proceedings for Ex M.L.A DSP Narender Singh Kadyan and SHO Uday Bhan Godara for mention of above mentioned 5 Hon'ble Judges involved by Ex M.L.A as at that time her aim was to defend the Ex M.L.A and eliminate me in police custody.

22. That on 23.11.2019 when Ms. Nisha transferred the file of my Complaint No. 445-1 of 24.12.2007 to other Ld. Court at that time She not transferred the other file of my other case the Calendra CHI-478-2018 as the other Ld. Court could compel the three prosecutors to record their evidence by issuing warrants to them.

Xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

24. That in the Contempt of Courts Act 1971 (Act No. 70 of 1971) the details are :-

A) Section 20 A Contempt case can be initiated only with in one year from the date on which the Alleged Contempt was committed.

B) After the 2006 Amendment, true and bona-fide criticism can be used as a defence.

C) This Act was enacted to maintain the dignity, authority and Sanctity of the Courts.

D) With the Amendment of Section 13 if disclosure of truth is in public interest and purpose of telling the truth is noble then it can not be considered a Contempt.

25. That the occurrence of Contempt is by the order Dated 8.8.2019 of Ms. Nisha Ld. S.D.J.M And the proceedings were initiated after about two years and 6 months on 21.2.2022 as per Para 24 A section 20 above the filing of Contempt was time barred as it was to be initiated with in one year of occurrence of contempt. On this point Please dismiss this time barred Contempt against me / Contemnor.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

27. *That this Act was enacted to maintain the dignity authority and sanctity of the Courts and I submitted my Application dated 18.11.2020 in the Ld. Court of Ms. Nisha for the sanctity of Hon'ble Judiciary. On this point only this Contempt Petition no. CROCP-1-2022 should be dismissed.*

28. *That as per amendment of Section 13 the disclosure of truth of corruption of Ms. Nisha is in public interest and purpose of talking the truth is noble that Mr. Justice Ramendra Jain and Ms. Nisha are being involved by Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal for not deciding the Criminal Complaint u/s 420,467,468,471,120-B, 218,506 CrPc for 7 months and charge sheeted me in false Calandra for not allowing the police to register FIR under these criminal section for which Ex M.L.A is responsible for life / death imprisonment. This Contempt Petition no. CROCP-1-2022 be dismissed for the cause of natural Justice and not to torture me mentally further.*

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

30. *That when corruption of Ms. Nisha is self proved and by law this Contempt Petition 1 of 2022 is not maintainable as per Paras 24 to 28 above then compelling my presence at Chandigarh on 11.5.2026 is a great injustice to me and instead of punishing the main culprit the Ex M.L.A Sh. Subhash Chand Goyal, his Ld. Lawyer Sh. Parveen Mittal, Ms. Nisha the Ld. S.D.J.M, Sh. Narender Singh Kadyan DSP and Sh. Uday Bhan Godara SHO City Police Station Hansi. Your Honours have defamed me in the public by sending 7 Police men including one lady Police to issue bailable warrants to me at my residence and then even after presenting the Surety person and identity person compelling me to appear in the Ld. Court of CJM Hisar was a big mental torture to whole of my family we two and our two daughters. With this much tensions any bad could happen with us as I have repeatedly*

mentioned that I lost my two post graduate daughters with the tension and torture by pistoldhari gundas of Ex M.L.A.

31. That if presence at Chandigarh on 11.5.2026 is not exempted and if anything worst happens then whole of India, my relatives and families in Punjab, Chandigarh, Delhi, Maharashtra and Chattisgarh would go to media that it was Hon'ble High Court For States of Punjab and Haryana who is responsible for eliminating me the Aggrieved instead of taking criminal action against Ex M.L.A Sh Subhash Chand Goyal for last 39 years.

32. That Hon'ble this High Court is not deciding the 10 Affidavits against 10 Hon'ble Judges 9 mentioned in its letter dated 7.4.2025 (Annexure 9) and 10th is Sh. Tarun Chaudhary Ld. J.M.F.C Hansi.

REFERENCE TO THE BRIEF NOTE/SYNOPSIS SUBMITTED BY AMICUS CURIAE

21. The Amicus Curiae appointed by this Court was also directed to submit a brief synopsis of the case. The needful was also done and he has submitted his impartial response on the facts of the case and the effect thereof.

22. He has also referred to the objection raised by the respondent-contemnor about the proceedings being time-barred as cognizance has been taken after a delay of more than 01 year from the date of the response. It is submitted by him that immediately after going through the contents of the application as well as the annexures appended thereto, which showed defamatory content, the matter was forwarded to the High Court through the District & Sessions Judge, Hisar on 09.09.2019. Hence, the contempt proceedings had been initiated within one year for taking necessary action against the respondent. It is thus submitted that the time consumed after the

initiation of the contempt proceedings and till its cognizance taken by the Court cannot be deemed as a period when proceedings had not been initiated. The process of putting up the matter before the Court for proceeding under the Contempt of Courts Act requires various formalities to be completed, including the reports to be sought, inquiry into the allegations levelled, etc. The requisite approvals from the competent authority are required to be taken. Thus, once the Judicial Officer has forwarded a reference for initiation of contempt to the competent authority, the same would satisfy the test of “Initiation of proceedings” as prescribed under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. The relevant part thereof, some of the submissions read thus: -

Legal Position

13. The offence of criminal contempt is defined under Section 2 (c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (hereinafter "1971 Act") as:

"(C) Criminal contempt" means the publication (whether by words, spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representations, or otherwise) of any matter or the doing of any other act whatsoever which-

- (i) Scandalizes or tends to scandalize, or lowers or tends to lower the authority of any Court; or*
- (ii) Prejudices or interferes or tends to interfere with, the due course of any judicial proceeding; or*

(iii) *Interferes or tends to interfere with, or obstructs or tends to obstruct, the administration of justice in any other manner;*

"High Court" means the High Court for a State or a Union territory and includes the Court of the Judicial Commissioner in any Union Territory.

14. *In the present case, since the material put forth by the Respondent was by way of applications/submissions before the Ld. Trial Court, Hansi, as well as this Hon'ble Court, it is imperative to examine whether the same would be considered "publication" as defined in Section 2 (c) of the 1971 Act. In this regard, reliance is placed upon the case of **S.K. Sundaram: In Re [Suo Moto Contempt Petition (Crl.) No. 5 of 2000]** passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India wherein it was opined:*

"13. Criminal contempt is thus vivisected into two categories. One is publication of any matter which scandalizes or tends to scandalize the authority of any court etc. Second is the doing of any act whatsoever, which scandalizes or tends to scandalize the authority of any court etc. If an act is not a criminal contempt merely because there was no publication such act would automatically fall within the purview of the other category because the latter consists of "the doing of any other act whatsoever". The latter category is thus a residuary category so wide enough from which no act of criminal contempt can possibly escape. The common denominator for both is that it scandalizes or tends to scandalize etc. of any court.

...

16. *In Halsbury's Laws of England, the learned author cited various decisions of courts in England, of which one at para 28 in Vol. 9 is worth extracting:*

"It is also a contempt to write threatening or abusive letters to a Judge in relation to the exercise of his judicial functions."

25. *In this connection a reference can be made to Gatley on Libel and Slander under the chapter "Publication" (Chap. 6). The learned author has stated the following:*

"222. How publication is effected: Publication is effected by any act on part of the defendant which conveys the defamatory meaning of the matter to the person to whom it is communicated.

223. If for example, a person reads a defamatory letter, knowing it is defamatory, to any person other than the person defamed, there is publication of the libel. Again, if the writer of a defamatory letter hands the letter to his clerk to be copied or typewritten before it is sent to the person defamed, and the clerk does copy or typewrite the letter, there is publication of the libel to the clerk."

15. *More recently, the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta, in the case of **Court of its own motion v. Raju Das and Ors. (2026 SCC OnLine Cal 8853)** opined that:*

"67. What can be culled out from the decisions discussed above are as follows:

(i) The judiciary is one of the three pillars of the Constitution along with the executive and the legislature. It has been entrusted with the job of

upholding the Rule of Law by orderly administration of justice. The judiciary functions through Judges and judicial officers.

(ii) The majesty of the Courts must be protected. This is because the Court is often the last resort for a citizen who has been wronged or who perceives to have been wronged. It is the Court which is empowered to afford redress to a person who complains of having been treated in a manner contrary to law.

(iii) Courts and Court orders must be respected and obeyed. Otherwise, lawlessness will become the order of the day.

(iv) A litigant or any stakeholder in a litigation cannot launch a scurrilous attack on the Court or a Judge before whom the concerned lis is pending. However dissatisfied such a person may be with the adjudicatory process or a Court order, he cannot indulge in any act or conduct and cannot publish any material, whether verbally or in writing, or indulge in any act or conduct that lowers or tends to lower the majesty of the Court. This would amount to interference with the administration of justice and will constitute criminal contempt.

(v) While a citizen's fundamental right of free speech under Article 19 of the Constitution is a valuable right, exercise of such right must be subject to the law relating to Contempt of Courts.

(vi) The law of contempt has been designed and promulgated not for protecting any particular Judge or judicial officer, but for preserving and upholding the institutional majesty of the Judiciary and justice delivery system and the sanctity of Court orders.

This is of utmost importance since if a person can get away after unfair and self-serving criticism of a Judge or can otherwise tarnish the image of the Judiciary with impunity, public confidence in the justice delivery system will erode. The biggest casualty will be the members of the public and greater public interest.

(vii) While fair criticism of a judicial order or judicial conduct may be acceptable, imputing improper or dishonest motive to a Judge cannot be permitted. Otherwise, in every litigation, the losing side is likely to denigrate the concerned Judge by imputing nefarious motive to him.

16. *Therefore, the aforesaid legal position stemming from the decisions referred to and read with the definition of Criminal Contempt as per the 1971 Act reflect that the remarks made by the Respondent, by their very nature, evidently amount to criminal contempt.*

17. *Reference is also made to Section 20 of the 1971 Act which reads as follows:*

"20. Limitation for actions for contempt: No court shall initiate any proceedings of contempt either on its own motion or otherwise, after the expiry of a period of one year from the date on which the contempt is alleged to have been committed.

18. *In the present case, reference is made to the office noting(s) detailed in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the written submissions herein which demonstrate that the process was initiated within the limitation period so prescribed. Even otherwise, reliance is placed upon the case of **Tamil Nadu Civil***

Supplies Corp. Ltd. v. A.T. Vijay Anand and Ors. (Contempt Petition Nos. 1010 to 1012 of 2020, Madras High Court) wherein it was observed that the one year period bar is not absolute in every circumstance. The High Court retains inherent power under Article 215 of the Constitution to act even after the statutory period has expired, but such power may be exercised only in exceptional circumstances, to mitigate gross injustice and must be used sparingly.

III. Records reflecting commission of criminal contempt by the Respondent; Aggravating and mitigating circumstances emanating from the records.

20. Pertinently, the Respondent/Contemnor has, till today, not tendered an apology with respect to the statements made. It is unfortunate that he has maintained the aforesaid position and allegations qua the then presiding judicial officers as recent as the last date of hearing. The reply, applications and written arguments, in brief, are a reiteration of his allegations qua the judicial officers and the opposite parties in his litigation. However, on the merits of the Respondent's case, two submissions warrant consideration by this Hon'ble Court:

(A) The Respondent has contended that there exists no publication of material and the allegations levelled are merely by way of applications filed before the court.

(B) The Respondent has submitted that the present proceedings are barred by limitation as the contempt proceedings were initiated after a period of one year.

(C) The Respondent has, at certain instances, also stated that he had no intention to malign the reputation of this Hon'ble Court and claims that his allegations are based on actual facts. However, the Respondent has not provided any supporting document or record to substantiate the same.

21. *The undersigned has endeavored to address the aforesaid submissions made by the Respondent in the Section II "Legal Position" portion of the present submissions, for the kind consideration of this Hon'ble Court. The legal position cited on the issue of publication as well as limitation does not favour the case of the Respondent. However, this Hon'ble Court may consider certain mitigating factors so far as the Respondent is concerned.*

22. *Pertinently, the Respondent is 81 years in age, he has claimed that he is suffering through various ailments. He has, for the past several years, ran door to door to further his legal claims against the opposite parties in the litigation. There include various instances in the court records where the Respondent has stated that he shall collapse or commit suicide. It appears that the Respondent therefore may not be in a position to independently and accurately assess the factual matter of the case and on account of his emotional state of mind, level assertions against any and every person not adhering to his view.*

23. *Admittedly, the above position of the Respondent cannot and should not bypass the manner in which he has conducted himself before this Hon'ble Court as well as other courts. However, for the consideration of this Hon'ble Court, the undersigned seeks to draw reference to the case of **Registrar, High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Bench at Aurangabad v. State of Maharashtra, 2007 SCC OnLine Bom 1006** wherein it was opined that normally a sentence of fine should be imposed and sentence of imprisonment should be restricted to the rarest of rare case wherein contemptuous act is per se so gross and reprehensible that sentence of punishment would be held disproportionate to it's gravity. Similarly, in the case of **Vineeta Srinandan v. High Court of Judicature at Bombay on its Own Motion, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2757** it was held that the statutory scheme of the 1971 Act is clear, once repentance is*

demonstrated, the Court may act with magnanimity. However, the apology must be bona fide and must satisfy the judicial conscience of the Court.

24. *In the present case, no demonstrated apology has been tendered till today. However, it is respectfully submitted that the majesty of this Hon'ble Court also finds basis on its magnanimity towards litigants like the Respondent. This Hon'ble Court has, time and again, upheld the values of transparency, integrity, and impartiality. Yet, the Respondent has continued to draw frivolous assertions without any basis whatsoever. It is in this backdrop that this Hon'ble Court ought to consider the fact that beyond the allegations levelled by the Respondent, such allegations were also made when the cases were sub judice and the attacks on every judicial officer examining the Respondent's matter fulfills the purpose of influencing the outcome of the cases under consideration.*

25. *The intention, therefore, is further presumed as that to obtain favourable outcomes and not merely that of a disgruntled litigant who was delivered an unfavourable order from the court. Further, the Respondent has time and again continued to demonstrate disrespect to the then SDJM, Hansi, such conduct further tends to lower the authority of a female judicial officer, holding a position which very often is the first forum of justice for any litigant. Making such assertions in open court, against a judicial officer performing their duty with the utmost integrity, must be cautioned by this Hon'ble Court. @Pg. 251 of the Court Record for instance reflects that the subject application which led to the initiation of the present proceedings was not the first time that the Respondent had interfered with the judicial proceedings.*

26. *As such, it is respectfully submitted that the present case reflects clear instances of criminal contempt on more than one occasion on part of the Respondent. However, this Hon'ble Court*

must consider the factum of age and ailments that the Respondent is undergoing whilst deciding the present case.

23. The Amicus Curiae had taken pains to refer to various pages where uncorroborated scandalous allegations had been levelled. The same are not being referred to since the extract of the submissions made by the respondent-contemnor has already also been reproduced in the order.

24. Even when the case was taken up on 07.08.2026, the respondent-contemnor had joined through video conferencing and he continued to reiterate the submissions made by him in the reply as well as in the show cause notice sent earlier in August, 2019. Despite repeated queries by the Court as to whether he intends to make any submissions with respect to the issue of contempt and refer to evidence to substantiate his allegation, the contemnor merely responded by repeating the same allegations. This Court also apprised the contemnor that only a limited aspect about the scandalous publication of the material and the allegation by the respondent-contemnor is the issue under consideration before this Court and his response ought to be confined to an explanation for his conduct instead of espousing his alleged grievance and reiteration of the allegations that led to initiation of the contempt proceedings at the first instance. The same has, however, made no impact, rather, he went on to impress that contempt proceedings should be decided at the earliest and the same has been unnecessarily delayed by the High Court and that if anything happens to him, he would go to the Media alleging that it is the High Court of Punjab and Haryana which is responsible for the harm that has come his way and that the High Court of Punjab and Haryana has failed to take

criminal action against the respondent-Ex-MLA in the contempt proceedings.

The matter was thereafter reserved for final orders.

CONSIDERATION AND CONCLUSIONS:-

25. Before proceeding to examine the material on record, it is necessary to set out the test that must guide this Court in determining whether the respondent-contemnor's conduct amounts to criminal contempt within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. As noted above, criminal contempt is made out where there is publication of any matter, or the doing of any act, which scandalises or tends to scandalise, or lowers or tends to lower the authority of any Court, or which prejudices or interferes with the due course of a judicial proceeding, or which obstructs or tends to obstruct the administration of justice in any other manner. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held in the matter of **S.K. Sundaram: In Re [Suo Moto Contempt Petition (Crl.) No. 5 of 2000]** that when an offence is disjunctive in character, it may need not itself amount to "publication" to attract liability. The residuary limb of "the doing of any other act whatsoever" is wide enough so that no act which scandalises the authority of a Court can escape its reach. It is equally well settled, as culled out by the Calcutta High Court in **Court on its own motion v. Raju Das and Ors. [2026 SCC OnLine Cal 8853]**, that while a litigant retains an undiminished right under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution to a fair and bona fide criticism of a judicial order, that right does not extend to a scurrilous attack on the Judge before whom the litigant's own matter is pending. The true distinction, well recognised in law, lies between an objective critique of the reasoning or correctness of an order on the one hand with an imputation of dishonest or improper motive to the Judge who passed

it on the other. Once a litigant crosses from the former into the latter, he cannot shelter behind the freedom of speech, since that freedom is, and has always been, subject to the law of contempt.

26. The exercise before this Court is accordingly not to re-adjudicate the correctness of the orders of which the respondent-contemnor complains, but to examine, order by order and allegation by allegation, whether the language and imputations employed by the respondent-contemnor remain within the zone of fair comment or whether they cross into personal vilification of the Judges and judicial officers concerned, unsupported by any material capable of substantiating the charge. It is with this test in mind that we now turn to examine the specific allegations levelled by the respondent-contemnor against each of the judicial officers named in the show cause notice dated 22.04.2019 and the subsequent correspondence.

27. We have heard the contemnor as well as an Amicus and have also gone through the material available on record, including the notice sent by the respondent-contemnor and his replies filed before this Court along with the arguments submitted followed by additional submissions. It has come forth from the above that the respondent-contemnor has not placed any evidence or material on record on the basis whereof it may be held that the allegations levelled by him against all and sundry have any merit. As a matter of fact, he has chosen not only to own the contents of the legal notice by reiterating the said submissions again and again but has also stood by the contents of the notice as well as the replies during the time of hearing of the case. Despite being granted an opportunity to prove his allegations or to bring any evidence on the basis whereof the contents of the show cause notice as well as the

replies may be accepted in a Court of law, he has chosen not to respond to the same. Rather, he has been raising fingers at Judges for having passed orders which are unacceptable to him. The Judicial order passed by the High Court as well as the Judges are labeled as 'illegal orders' by the respondent-contemnor himself for reasons such as passing orders about exemption from appearance and not issuing notice to the Advocate representing the rival part, extracting the interim order in the subsequent orders and the order granting stay on proceedings including that the Judge of the High Court misconducted in setting aside an order of the Subordinate Court in a non-bailable crime and seeking an explanation that the concerned Judge should deny his involvement and explain legality of his orders.

28. Similarly, while incarcerating another Judge, the contemnor has proceeded on an assumption that the respondent-accused in his complaint was known to the Judge, but no evidence of any nature has been placed on record. He further contends that the order granting stay was illegal since the petition itself was not maintainable and that the Judge was required to issue notice to the Lawyer of the opposite party and that, as a result of his interim order, theft of public money has been allowed to the accused persons despite the Ex-MLA being nominated as an accused in a non-bailable offence and allegedly claiming extortion through armed persons. It is further alleged that the accused-Ex-MLA (in the complaint) did not deny an allegation that he knew the Judge in the reply so filed.

29. Similarly, against the third Judge of the High Court, it has been stated that the orders were illegal and that the Judge could not have stayed the proceedings before the Subordinate Court and that the matter was not decided

quickly even though the Supreme Court mandated that the matter involving Ex-MLA should be decided expeditiously. He claimed that the Judge was bound to decide on a day-to-day basis without any break and that the interim order had been passed without issuing a prior notice to the Counsel opposite and thus facilitated the Ex-MLA to continue his unlawful activities and make illegal collections. The proceedings having not been decided, it was alleged that it was a misconduct on the part of the Judge of the High Court. Similar allegations have been levelled against the two other Judges of the High Court. Additionally, allegations of a similar nature have been levelled against the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrates who dealt with the case at the trial Court level as well as the Members of the Superior Judicial Services in Haryana who dealt with the matter on appellate/revisional stages, hence, sparing none. The only plea is taken to purge the content are technical. They are now being dealt with hereinafter below: -

- i) The contempt is time-barred in view of Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act.

30. It is however relevant to refer to the necessary statutory provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, to examine the defence.

A) Section 2 (c)

(c) criminal contempt means the publication (whether by words, spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representations, or otherwise) of any matter or the doing of any other act whatsoever which

(i) scandalises or tends to scandalise, or lowers or tends to lower the authority of, any Court; or

(ii) prejudices, or interferes or tends to interfere with, the due course of any judicial proceeding; or

(iii) interferes or tends to interfere with, or obstructs or tends to obstruct, the administration of justice in any other manner;

B) Section 12

12. Punishment for contempt of Court. - *(1) Save as otherwise expressly provided in this Act or in any other law, a contempt of Court may be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees, or with both:*

Provided that the accused may be discharged or the punishment awarded may be remitted on apology being made to the satisfaction of the Court.

Explanation. - *An apology shall not be rejected merely on the ground that it is qualified or conditional if the accused makes it bona fide.*

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no Court shall impose a sentence in excess of that specified in sub-section (1) for any contempt either in respect of itself or of a Court subordinate to it.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section, where a person is found guilty of a civil contempt, the Court, if it considers that a fine will not meet the ends of justice and that a sentence of imprisonment is necessary shall, instead of sentencing him to simple imprisonment, direct that he be detained in a civil prison for such period not exceeding six months as it may think fit.

(4) Where the person found guilty of contempt of Court in respect of any undertaking given to a Court is a company, every person

who, at the time the contempt was committed, was in charge of, and was responsible to, the company for the conduct of the business of the company, as well as the company, shall be deemed to be guilty of the contempt and the punishment may be enforced with the leave of the Court, by the detention in civil prison of each such person:

Provided that nothing contained in this sub-section shall render any such person liable to such punishment if he proves that the contempt was committed without his knowledge or that he exercised all due diligence to prevent its commission.

(5) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (4), where the contempt of Court referred to therein has been committed by a company and it is proved that the contempt has been committed with the consent or connivance of, or is attributable to any neglect on the part of, any director, manager, secretary or other officer of the company, such director, manager, secretary or other officer shall also be deemed to be guilty of the contempt and the punishment may be enforced, with the leave of the Court, by the detention in civil prison of such director, manager, secretary or other officer.

Explanation. - For the purpose of sub-sections (4) and (5), -

(a) company means any body corporate and includes a firm or other association of individuals; and

(b) director, in relation to a firm, means a partner in the firm

Section 20

20. Limitation for actions for contempt. - No Court shall initiate any proceedings for contempt, either on its own motion or otherwise, after the expiry of a period of one year from the date on which the contempt is alleged to have been committed.

31. While the projected argument of the complainant is that the legal notice was put up before the Court in August, 2019, but the matter was put up before the Division Bench only in 2022; hence, it is barred by limitation as prescribed under Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1961, which prescribes the limitation for initiation of the contempt proceedings.

32. We have no hesitation to hold that the aforesaid objection is bereft of merit. The stage where the matter came up before the Division Bench of the High Court, after necessary reports from the officials, is the stage where the cognizance of the contempt reference is taken by the Division Bench of this Court. Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts Act uses the term “No Court shall initiate any proceedings of contempt”.

33. These two expressions are of significance. The first expression used under Section 20 is “Court”. While, in a generic sense, Court may include every adjudicatory body which is a Court of record, including the High Court, however, the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 does not define the expression “Court” but also uses the expression High Court specifically under Section 2 (b). Thus, on a purposive interpretation, the expression “Court” used in Section 20 has to be perceived generally.

34. Adverting to the second expression used, i.e. “Initiate any proceedings”. The use of the expression “Initiation” is legally distinct from “cognizance”. The words “Initiate” and “cognizance” have been defined in **Black’s Law Dictionary** as under: -

Initiate means “*To commence, begin or set in motion*”

Cognizance means “*A court's right and power to try and to determine cases; or the taking of judicial or authoritative notice.*”

35. As against the expression “initiate” the expression “cognizance” is a term used when an application of judicial mind takes place on the complaint (supra) initiated. Thus, initiation is a first stage for taking cognizance of any Contumacious behaviour or conduct.

36. Both these words are not synonymous and are not to be used interchangeably since they refer to different stages of proceedings in a Court of law. The initiation being a first step towards taking proceedings against a person, thus had to be understood as the stage when a reference is sent by the Magistrate. Needless to mention that in a reference of Criminal contempt, only a Division Bench of the High Court is competent to take cognizance. Thus, the role of the Magistrate making a reference would come to an end immediately after he forwards such a reference, through proper channel, to the High Court.

37. Undisputedly, in the present case, the application for issuing bailable warrants against the respondent-accused in the complaint had been moved on 08.08.2019, and the reference was sent by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Hansi on 09.09.2019; hence, it cannot be said that there was any delay in initiating proceedings by the Court. The proceedings that took place at the departmental level in the form of seeking reports and comments and their preliminary examination by the authorised branches would not be accepted as the basis to hold that the proceedings would be barred by limitation prescribed under Section 20 of the Contempt of Courts

Act merely because in the said process a period of more than one year elapsed. The position in law is settled through a catena of Judgements, some of which have already been mentioned by the Amicus in his submissions filed before this Court. The same are not being referred to again to avoid repetition

38. The second argument that has been raised is that the averments contained in the legal notice as well as the responses filed are true and *bona fide* criticism and that it paves the way for a valid defence.

39. We have gone through the record and on consideration of the submissions and the objection raised, we are of the opinion that the aforesaid objection also lacks merit. Section 5 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 exempts fair criticism of judicial act to be exempted from proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act. The same reads thus: -

Section 5

5. Fair criticism of judicial act not contempt. - A person shall not be guilty of contempt of Court for publishing any fair comment on the merits of any case which has been heard and finally decided.

40. On consideration of the response filed and the contents of the notice as well as the replies along with the written argument filed by the respondent-contemnor, we have no hesitation to hold that the aforesaid defence is not available to the respondent-contemnor. In the matter of ***“Advocate General versus Abraham George” 1976 (Crl. L.J.) 158***, it was held that to avail the defence under Section 5 of the Contempt of Courts Act, the person has to publish a fair comment on the merits of any case and that a criticism of the judgment has to be done without casting aspersions on the Judges and the Courts and without adverse comments amounting to

scandalizing the Courts. Further, the said Section would come into force only once the matter has been finally decided.

41. The legal position that emerges from the foregoing may be summarized thus. Firstly, publication within the meaning of Section 2(c) stands satisfied once the impugned material is communicated to a third person and filing of an application together with its annexures before a Court, with copies necessarily going on the record and to the opposite side, meets this threshold. Secondly, the material must be examined to see whether it scandalizes or tends to scandalize the authority of the Court, or interferes with the due course of a judicial proceeding, within the meaning of Section 2(c). Thirdly, where such scandalizing material is found, the burden shifts to the contemnor to establish that it falls within one of the statutory exceptions that is fair comment on a finally decided case under Section 5, or truth in the public interest under Section 13(b) failing which no further inquiry into intention is necessary. Criminal contempt of this kind does not require proof of mens rea.

42. In the present case, the extracts reproduced above clearly show that the respondent-Contemnor has indulged himself in personal vilification of all the Judges who happened to deal with the case at any stage and who passed interim orders which were perceived by the respondent-contemnor to be contrary to his interest. The respondent-contemnor is a person of experience and given the fact that he repeatedly insisted that he does not need legal support and is well equipped and acquainted to defend himself, he is deemed to be aware of the implications of his action. The distinction between an objective and fair criticism of a judgment and criticism and vilification of a Judge are two different acts. The contents extracted above established

without doubt that the respondent-contemnor has indulged in vilification of the Judges and has indulged in a systematic attack on judicial system by repeatedly attributing motives to each and every person. The scurrilous allegations which are not corroborated by any evidence on record are thus based upon fanciful beliefs entertained by the respondent-contemnor.

43. We find it an emerging trend that when a litigant feels prejudice on account of an interim order passed against him, instead of taking recourse to the remedies provided to him in law, he tends to take an easier route, i.e. to start levelling frivolous allegations against the Judicial officers who happened to deal with the matter and to put them under pressure in the said guise. Ordinarily, once such allegations are levelled against incumbent officer and that too in his personal capacity, such officer would generally tend to recuse himself or not advance any further in the matter lest he may be accused of having passed subsequent orders on account of any bias. Instead of pursuing his remedies before the appellate/higher forums, the respondent-contemnor, instead, resorted to a structured vilification campaign against all officers and Judges. In our opinion, the delay which seemingly occurred in adjudication of the dispute can very well also be because of the conduct and the temperament of the respondent-contemnor himself in accusing each and every person.

44. The conduct in question is not without precedent before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In *In Re: Vijay Kurle & Ors. [Suo Motu Contempt Petition (Crl.) No. 2 of 2019]*, the Supreme Court dealt with advocates who had circulated complaints containing scurrilous allegations against sitting Judges of that Court. The Court found there was not an iota of remorse or any semblance of apology on behalf of the contemnors, and held that the

complaints were sent with a view to intimidate the Judges, so that no action would be taken against one of the contemnors, characterising this as a concerted effort to virtually hold the Judiciary to ransom. The parallel to the present case is direct that the respondent-contemnor has similarly persisted, without remorse and without an iota of substantiating evidence, in casting aspersions on named Judges and judicial officers across multiple proceedings that were sub judice, with the stated object of pressurizing them into recusal or into deciding matters in his favour. The same principle was reiterated by a three-Judge Bench in In ***Re: Prashant Bhushan [Suo Motu Contempt Petition (Crl.) No. 1 of 2020]***, where the Court held that dissatisfaction with a judicial order, however genuine, cannot translate into an imputation of corrupt or mala fide motive against the Judge who passed it as a principle squarely applicable here, where the respondent-contemnor has, in respect of virtually every judicial officer who dealt with his litigation, demanded that the officer "deny" personal involvement with the opposite party, without a shred of independent proof.

45. Besides, the aforesaid defence can be availed only once a final judgment is passed. In the present case, notwithstanding that the comments extracted in the present order are vilification and scandalous/scurrilous remarks against the Judge, it is also observed that Section 5 of the Contempt of Courts Act, as a defence, can be invoked only after passing of a final judgment and not at any point prior thereto. Undisputedly, the final judgment had not been passed. Thus, the objection lacks merit and is accordingly dismissed.

46. The next objection raised to the continuation of the proceeding is that if the act is in the nature of disclosure of truth and is in public interest, such disclosure or publication cannot be considered as contempt.

47. In order to appreciate the argument, Section 13 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is reproduced hereinafter below:-

13. Contempts not punishable in certain cases. - Notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, -

(a) no Court shall impose a sentence under this Act for a contempt of Court unless it is satisfied that the contempt is of such a nature that it substantially interferes, or tends substantially to interfere with the due course of justice;

(b) the Court may permit, in any proceeding for contempt of Court, justification by truth as a valid defence if it is satisfied that it is in public interest and the request for invoking the said defence is bona fide.

48. The defence invoked by the petitioner is under Section 13 (b) of the Act. While it is not disputed that the said defence would be available when the content is true and is required to be disclosed in public interest, however, the contempt extracted above is nowhere even close to the truth and is only perceived as proved by the contemnor.

49. For invoking the defence of “Truth”, the onus lies upon the contemnor to prove the same. An uncorroborated belief cannot be perceived either as a truth in fact or in law. Imaginative belief spun out of thin air, fortified by repeated thought and senseless action, cannot partake the character of truth. A lie hammered and clamoured again and again does not acquire the character of truth. The contemnor in the present case has resorted to just the same. Apart from his levelling scandalous allegation and repetition

thereof through multiple correspondence, there is nothing on record to establish the truthfulness of his allegations.

50. The next part of the sub-section would thus not even come into play because the content itself being false, there can be no valid defence to plead that he was doing so in public interest, rather, the conduct itself displays that it was a brazen attempt to scandalize the judicial system by attacking the integrity, impartiality and authority of the Judges and the Courts. The Hon'ble Supreme court in the case of **Indirect Tax Practitioners' Assn. v. R.K. Jain,** reported as **(2010) 8 SCC 281** held as under: -

“The substituted Section 13 represents an important legislative recognition of one of the fundamentals of our value system i.e. truth. The amended section enables the court to permit justification by truth as a valid defence in any contempt proceeding if it is satisfied that such defence is in public interest and the request for invoking the defence is bona fide. In our view, if a speech or article, editorial, etc. contains something which appears to be contemptuous and this Court or the High Court is called upon to initiate proceedings under the Act and Articles 129 and 215 of the Constitution, the truth should ordinarily be allowed as a defence unless the Court finds that it is only a camouflage to escape the consequences of deliberate or malicious attempt to scandalise the court or is an interference with the administration of justice. Since, the petitioner has not even suggested that what has been mentioned in the editorial is incorrect or that the respondent has presented a distorted version of the facts, there is no warrant for discarding the respondent's assertion that whatever he has written is based on true facts and the sole object of writing the editorial was to enable the authorities concerned to take corrective/remedial measures.”

51. Under the given circumstances, we are of the opinion that the respondent-contemnor is guilty of having committed Contempt of Court under Section 2 (c) of the Contempt of Courts Act as punishable under Section 12 by publication of scandalizing material by levelling scurrilous remarks against the integrity, impartiality not only of the Judges but also of the institution of administration of justice by publication of insinuating remarks as well as threatening the Court including the High Court that if any harm is caused to him, he shall hold the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh responsible for the same.

52. The conduct of the contemnor was not a solitary or spontaneous outburst but a sustained campaign spanning several proceedings and several years and reiterated even after notice of contempt was issued as well as during the pendency of the present proceedings, without the slightest indication of remorse or a bona fide apology at any stage.

53. The matter may now be listed for hearing the respondent-contemnor on quantum of sentence for 12.10.2026.

54. Let bailable warrants be issued to secure his presence before the Court on the next date of hearing.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

07.09.2026

Raj arora/vishal sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No