

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Debangsu Basak

And

The Hon'ble Justice Md. Shabbar Rashidi

M.A.T. 962 of 2024

Arunangshu Chakraborty

vs.

The High Court at Calcutta Adjudicator
at Calcutta & Anr.

With

CAN 1 of 2024

For the Appellant : Mr. Arunangshu Chakraborty (in person)

For the Writ Petitioner : Mr. Piyush Chaturvedi, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Tarun Kumar Das
Mr. Pratap Kumar Yadav

For the University : Mr. Soumya Majumder, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Pratik Majumder
Mr. Kinnor Ghosh

Heard & Judgment on : **May 14, 2025**

DEBANGSU BASAK, J.:-

1. Appeal is directed against an order dated May 10, 2024 passed in W.P.C.R.C 206 of 2023.
2. Appellant appears in person.
3. In response to the query of the Court, appellant submits that, the appeal is limited to the portion of the order dated May 10, 2024 which invokes

Section 14 of the Contempt of Court's Act, 1971 as against him. He submits that, there is a chequered history with regard to the contempt proceedings that he is facing before the learned Single Judge. He submits that, one of the orders passed by this Division Bench was assailed in a Special Leave Petition. In respect of another Special Leave Petition, the Supreme Court granted him leave to apologize to the learned Single Judge which he did. He submits that, learned Single Judge was pleased not to accept such apology for which he approached the Supreme Court. Such applications are presently before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

4. Appellant submits that, he is well aware of the proposition governing the an appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, 1865 as also an appeal in terms of Section 19 of the Contempt of Court's Act, 1971.
5. Learned advocate appearing for the parties in which the order dated May 10, 2024 was passed are present.
6. We find from the records that, learned Single Judge after issuing *suo motu* criminal contempt rule against the appellant was pleased to notice that the appellant without taking permission of the Court recorded proceedings of the Court on April 30, 2024 when the appellant appeared through online. Learned Single Judge in the order dated April 30, 2024 recorded about the disrespectful gestures and demeanour of the appellant who appeared

- online. In such context, learned Single Judge returned a *prima facie* finding that the unauthorized recording of the disrespectful conduct towards the Court was an act of contempt on the face of the Court. Consequently, learned Single Judge in addition to the issuance of *suo motu* contempt rule, decided to proceed against the appellant under Section 14 of the Contempt of Court's Act, 1971. Learned Single Judge recorded that formal charge will be framed as against the appellant on the next date of hearing when the appellant was required to be personally present.
7. We do not find from the materials made available on record that any final decision was arrived at by the learned Single Judge in respect of the portion of the order dated May 10, 2024 with which the appellant is aggrieved with. No right of the appellant stands affected. Appellant did not suffer any punishment under the Contempt of Court's Act, 1971.
 8. In such circumstances, we find no merit in the present appeal.
 9. M.A.T. 962 of 2024 and the connected application being CAN 1 of 2024 are dismissed without any order as to costs.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

10. I agree

S.D.

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)