

Sr. No.224

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

CROCP NO.6 OF 2016

Date of Decision: May 03, 2017

Court on its own motion

.....Petitioner

VS.

S.P.Verma, Advocate, District Court, Sonapat

....Contemnor

**CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE DR. SHEKHER DHAWAN**

Present:- S.P.Verma, Contemner in person.
Mr. Vivek Saini, DAG, Haryana.

-.-

MAHESH GROVER, J

These contempt proceedings were initiated against the
contemner on a report received from Sh.Vishesh Garg, Judicial Magistrate
Ist Class, Sonapat, which may be extracted here below:-

*“It is respectfully submitted that a complaint case
bearing No.67-2 dated 02.01.2015 under Section
138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, titled as Anil
Jain v. Rajender Parsad Jain, was pending before
this Court for today i.e 03.02.2016. On the previous
date of hearing i.e 23.12.2015, an application had
been filed on behalf of the complainant for
cancellation of the bail granted to the accused on
18.12.2015. Today, reply to the said application
was filed by the learned counsel. Learned counsel
for the accused also moved an application for
exemption from personal appearance of the*

CROCP NO.6 OF 2016 -2-

accused, which was allowed with a direction to the accused to place on record the death certificate of his relative.

It is necessary to mention here that when the case was taken up today, learned counsel for the complainant contemptuously and threateningly stated that the complainant has already made a complaint against the undersigned before the learned District & Sessions Judge, Sonipat and the explanation regarding the same must have called from the undersigned. Learned counsel for the complainant further stated that the complainant has no faith in this Court. The undersigned politely asked learned counsel for the complainant that if it is so, then he should move an application to that effect before the learned CJM, Sonipat for transfer of the case. At this, learned counsel for the complainant blatantly replied that orders are being passed in favour of the accused. The language used by the learned counsel for the complainant are not only derogatory but also contemptuous. Copy of the Zimni order dated 03.02.2016 has been attached herewith.”

The contemner appeared before us and expressed his regrets and on 10.01.2017 had given an undertaking to tender his unqualified apology to the officer concerned pursuant to which he has done so as is

CROCP NO.6 OF 2016 -3-

evident from the report of Judicial Officer dated 12.04.2017.

Since the contemner has tendered unqualified apology to the Court below as also before us, we would deem it appropriate to give quittance to the matter and discharge the rule against the contemner.

Disposed of.

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

May 03, 2017
mamta

(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No