



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CACP-70-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision:- 18.07.2025

Narender

...Appellant(s)

Versus

Ankit Chahal and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE**
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Anshumaan Dalal, Advocate,
 Mr. Sandeep Kashyap, Advocate,
 for the appellant.

Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate
 (through video conferencing),
 Mr. Manik Moudgil, Advocate,
 Mr. Navdeep Khokhar, Advocate,
 Mr. Preet Kamal Uppal, Advocate,
 for the caveator – respondent No. 1.

* * * *

SHEEL NAGU, C.J. (ORAL)

CM-13568-CII-2025

For the reasons mentioned therein, the delay of 24 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

The application stands disposed of.

CACP-70-2025

1. The appellant, who was one of the contemnors (respondent No. 4) in COCP-4809-2024, is before this Court in this appeal filed under Section 19(1)(a) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Rule 12 of Contempt of Courts (Punjab & Haryana) Rules, 1974 against an order dated 21.05.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge exercising contempt jurisdiction finding a *prima-facie* case against respondents No. 3 and 4 (appellant herein) and

framing charges under Sections 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

2. An appeal against an order passed by the Contempt Court is maintainable only when the Contempt Court punishes the contemnor or takes a view in express terms, which gives an impression that the Contempt Court has made up its mind to punish. Thus, every interlocutory order in a pending COCP is not appealable (please see: *Midnapore Peoples’ Coop. Bank Ltd. and others Vs. Chunilal Nanda and others* (2006) 5 SCC 399).

3. In the present case, the challenge is to the *prima-facie* view of the Contempt Court in finding that respondents No. 3 and 4 (appellant herein) are guilty of contempt and directing for framing of charges.

4. The next stage would be to call for response of the appellant and the other contemnors and thereafter to decide on the question as to whether to punish the said contemnors who have been *prima-facie* held responsible for committing contempt. It is at that stage that the right to file an appeal fructifies and not prior thereto.

5. The appeal being premature is dismissed with hope and expectation that the contentions raised in this appeal would be considered in the response filed by the appellant to the charges and the Contempt Court shall not be prejudiced against the appellant/contemnor for having approached this Court.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

18.07.2025
Amodh Sharma

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