



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 4 OF 2005

(Smt. B.P. Thacker, Judge, Family Court, Nagpur Vs. Smt. Daksha M. Chandan)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. I.J. Damle, A.P.P. for the State.
Ms Daksha Chandan, party in person.

.....

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE AND
RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.
DECEMBER 2, 2025

On previous date, following order was
passed :

“Heard for some time.

2. *The preliminary objection is that there is no compliance of Rule 12 of the Contempt of Courts (Bombay High Court) Rules, 1994. Our attention is invited to Clause (b) of Rule 12, which reads as under:*

“(b) Before making a reference the subordinate Court shall hold a preliminary enquiry by issuing a Show Cause Notice accompanied by copies of relevant documents, if any, to the contemnor and after hearing him the subordinate Court shall write a concise reasoned Order of Reference indicating the nature of the Contempt and the person/persons alleged to have committed it.”

3. *The argument is that the order of reference does not indicate the compliance of this clause and therefore the reference is not maintainable.*

4. *Learned APP shall go through the order of reference and make submissions.*

5. *List on 2nd December, 2025.”*

2] The learned A.P.P. submits that he has gone through the file to find that there is no compliance of

Clause (b) of Rule 12 of the Contempt of Courts (Bombay High Court) Rules, 1994.

3] That being so, there is inherent defect in the reference. The reference, therefore, is dropped.

4] The contempt petition is disposed of in terms of above. Pending application also stands disposed of.

(JUDGE)

(JUDGE)

Sumit