

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR

CCP(S) 221/2026 in [WP(C) 800/2026].

Gulzar Ahmad & Anr.

...Applicant(s)/Petitioner(s)

Through: Mr. Syed Aushaq Hussain, Advocate.

VERSUS

Hariprasad K. K. & others.

...Respondent(s)

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAHUL BHARTI, JUDGE.

ORDER
20.07.2026

1. The two petitioners, as husband and wife, came forward with writ petition- **WP(C) No. 800/2026** in which they named private respondents at serial Nos. 8 and 9 by reference to whom they came to allege that there is a threat to the life and property of the petitioners in the context of land dispute measuring **10 kanals** and **8.5 marlas** comprising khasra **No. 29** situated at Green Avenue, Sector-1, Land-2, Peerbagh, Hyderpora, Srinagar, along with an approach pathway, and therefore invited this Court, without adjudication on merits, for disposal of the writ petition with a direction that their representation made to the Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP), Budgam, on **02.04.2026**, seeking immediate police protection for safeguarding the life and property of the petitioners and their


family members and for ensuring compliance with court orders, be considered and dealt with.

2. This Court, without adjudicating on merits, felt persuaded to dispose of the writ petition at the motion stage with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP), Budgam, to examine the matter and provide police protection to the petitioners, if needed, and accordingly disposed of the writ petition by virtue of an order dated **22.04.2026**.
3. The petitioners have come back with a contempt petition- **CCP(S) No. 221/2026** alleging that the respondent No. 1- Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP), Budgam, the respondent No. 2- DySP Budgam and the private respondents No. 3 and 4 are guilty of contempt of court by reference to the court's direction.
4. This Court is at a loss to figure out as to how the respondents No. 2 to 4 have come to be named as party respondents in the present contempt petition when the writ court's order dated **22.04.2026** is, at the most, bearing a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP), Budgam to examine the matter and deal with the same.
5. Thus, this Court has no iota of doubt that the petitioners are bent upon to scandalize the situation for their benefit and exploit the same by reference to an ongoing civil suit, otherwise, the High Court would not have been asked, in a writ petition, to

pass directions for ensuring compliance with court orders as if the High Court is sub-serving to the civil court seized of the *lis* between the petitioners and the private respondents, for which the civil court otherwise is equally competent by reference to the scope of authority vested in it under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

6. The present contempt petition-**CCP(S) 221/2026** is, thus, seriously misconceived and is **dismissed**.
7. A copy of this order be forwarded to the Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP), Budgam for the sake of notice and record.

SRINAGAR
20.07.2026
Bisma Jan.



(RAHUL BHARTI)
JUDGE