

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

AMIT KUMAR
2019.05.09 18:04
Ensures the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CWP-PIL-No. 100 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.05.2019

Anju Bansal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNA MURARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE

Present: Petitioner in person.

The petitioner, who appears in person, purport to have approached this Court in Public Interest and has claimed the following reliefs:-

“[A] Prayed to pass orders in the petition of Public Interest Litigation under Article 226 of the Constitution of India against the order dated 15.3.2009 (P-8), passed in false and frivolous CROCP No. 10 of 2015 by the double bench of Justice Jaswant Singh and Justice Arun Kumar Tyagi and praying to pass the order to prayed to pass orders to prevent abuse of the process of the court and ends of justice for the protection of the disabled petitioner/victim U/S 7 of the Rights of persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, for protection from abuse, violence and exploitation by stopping unnecessary harassment from Senior Judges in connivance with the relative judges of the rapists in the Punjab and Haryana High Court along with the team of Senior Advocates.

[B] Prayed before Hon'ble Court to stay the proceedings of the CROCP No. 10 of 2015 and to decide the case on merits by his own Court.

[C] Prayed to pass orders and direct the respondent No.3 PPS to the Hon'ble Chief Justice of Punjab and Haryana

AMIT KUMAR
2019.05.09 18:04
No. 100 of 2019
integrity of this document

High Court to produce the complaint vide letter No. K-14012/14/2015-US-2 and complaint of letter No L-15012/2/2016-JUS.1 and to bring the complaint send by way of affidavit on dated 29.5.2015.

[D] Prayed to pass orders and direct the respondent No.4 Registrar General of Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh for inquiry of the case.

(E) Prayed to pass show cause notice to Sh. Virinder Aggarwal that why he was not allowing the petitioner to exhibit the medical record in the case of Gang rape.

[F] Prayed to pass any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

Albeit, the petition at hands is styled as Public Interest Litigation, but a bare analysis of the averments set out therein shows that it is centered on purely personal and private interest of the petitioner. Further, the order dated 15.03.2019 (actually passed on 4.4.2019), the petitioner is aggrieved by, is passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in proceedings arising out of a criminal contempt, i.e. **CROCP No.10 of 2015 (Court on its own motion Vs. Anju Bansal)**, against the petitioner (contemner) herself. In fact, the nature of the reliefs that have been prayed for: ***“to stay the proceedings of the CROCP No.10 of 2015 and to decide the case on merits by his own Court,*** raise serious issues as regards the feasibility of such a prayer before a Co-ordinate Bench. We refrain ourselves to delve further in the matter, lest it prejudice the case/interest of the petitioner in different proceedings that are pending against her before this Court. Suffice it to say, this petition has been filed for an oblique purpose.

In so far as the grievance being expressed by the petitioner that proceedings in the criminal contempt are pending against her since long and, therefore, orders be passed requiring the Co-ordinate Bench to decide the matter

AMIT KUMAR
2019.05.09 18:04
No signature or stamp
integrity of this document

expeditiously: we are afraid that this Court lacks authority and jurisdiction to issue any such direction. However, she be assured that her concerns in this regard would be addressed on the administrative side.

In the wake of the above, for the petition is bereft of any public interest, the same is accordingly dismissed being not maintainable. However, for the grievances as also the reliefs being sought are personal to the petitioner, she is at liberty to pursue or resort to the remedies as admissible in law.

Needless to assert that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion upon the pending proceedings against the petitioner or initiated at her behest.

(KRISHNA MURARI)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

08.05.2019
AK Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No