



\$~89

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8318/2024, CRL.M.A. 31762/2024

ANIL PATHAK & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Soibal Gupta and Mr. Himanshu
Swami, Advs.

versus

STATE OF (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr.Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for State
with IO/SI Richa, PS Fatehpur Beri
and SI Pooja, PS Bhalswa Dairy.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

21.10.2024

1. The present petition has been preferred by the petitioner being aggrieved with the directions passed by the learned Trial Court in the impugned order dated 20.09.2024 in terms of paragraphs 9 & 10 thereof.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present incident pertains to 16.08.2024 when the son of the accused clicked picture/videos inside the Court Room. On being supplied with the aforesaid information, learned counsel merely pointed out to the Trial Court as to the probability of tutoring of the witness. He, however, submits that he did so as a counsel and that he had no personal knowledge or information.
3. Insofar as the observations against the son of the accused are concerned, the same are still pending consideration before the concerned Court, wherein he has been asked to show cause. The petitioners would be at liberty to reply to the said show cause notice, which would be considered in



accordance with law.

4. Insofar as the direction to the Bar Council is concerned, the explanation tendered by the learned counsel for the petitioners is that he only pointed out what his client had informed him and that at no point in time, he had any intention to lower the dignity of the Court. The explanation tendered by the learned counsel is found to be satisfactory and the directions contained in paragraph 10 of the impugned order is set aside.

5. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of alongwith miscellaneous application.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

OCTOBER 21, 2024

akc