



\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 13/2018 & CRL.M.A. 30409/2018,**
CRL.M.A.30410/2018, CRL.M.A. 30411/2018
DEEPAK KHOSLAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.
versus

RISHI SOOD & ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Dubey & Mr. Jay Savla, Sr. Adv, Mr. S. K. Dubey, Mr. Anand Mishra, Mr. Rishi Sood, Advs with Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, Mr. Tushar and Mr. Anand M Mishra, Advs. for R-1
Ms. Rebecca John, Sr. Adv. along with Mr. Harsh Bohra, Mr. Pravir Singh, Ms. Anushka Baruah, Ms. Ajunee Singh, Advs., R- 2 (M: 9827270249)

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER
% **03.12.2024**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. This is a criminal contempt which has been initiated on the basis of allegations raised by the Petitioner against Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, namely Mr. Rishi Sood and Mr. Nikhil Ranjan Ahuja, respectively, who are both advocates.
3. The brief facts leading to the present petitioner are that there are several long drawn litigations pending between the Petitioner and the Respondent Nos. 5 to 8, as also various other corporate entities. One such litigation was



pending before the Court of Id. CMM, Saket District Courts, in which a hearing was fixed on 5th August, 2017. On the said date, after the hearing was over there appears to have been a scuffle, outside the courtroom, between the Petitioner and the Respondent No.1. The allegations of the Petitioner is that the Respondent No.1 had indulged in physical blows on him. The stand on behalf of the Respondent No.1 is that the Petitioner was guilty of provocation which led to the scuffle and both Petitioner and Respondent No.1 were injured as a result of the same. Reliance is placed upon the MLCs of both the Petitioner and the Respondent No. 1, which was conducted after the incident to show the injuries suffered by both the parties.

4. Today, the Court has briefly heard submissions by the Petitioner as also on behalf of Respondent Nos. 1 and 2. The Court has also viewed the CCTV footage of 5th August, 2017, recorded outside Court Room No. 305, Saket District Courts, which has been retrieved from the District Court Saket. The said CCTV footage upon being viewed, this Court is of the opinion that considering the nature of the litigation and the fact that Respondent No.1 is an advocate, the matter ought to be brought to a quietus by Respondent No.1 tendering an apology to the Court. Respondent No.1 is present in Court. He has tendered an unconditional apology, without attempting to justify his conduct in any manner.

5. Needless to add, the Court has viewed the CCTV footage and it is unclear as to what led to the provocation, as the Respondent No.1 is seen initially exiting the Court room peacefully. Under these circumstances, the Court has accepted the apology of Respondent No. 1.

6. Insofar as Respondent No.2 is concerned, he does not have any role in the alleged scuffle as seen from the CCTV footage, accordingly, the



proceedings against Respondent No.2 are dropped.

7. Mr. Rishi Sood, Advocate/Respondent No.1, submits that he is willing to make a voluntary donation of Rs. 1,00,000/- to the Delhi State Legal Services Authority (DSLISA). Let him do so within four weeks. The same would not in any manner be taken as a reflection upon his conduct. The same shall be considered to be a voluntary donation.

8. The apology by Respondent No. 1 having been accepted by this Court, the present order or the contempt proceedings shall not be made a ground for initiating any other proceeding against Respondent No.1.

9. The present contempt petition is disposed of in these terms. All pending applications are also disposed of.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

AMIT SHARMA, J.

DECEMBER 03, 2024

dj/ms