



111

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

COCP-4413-2025**Date of decision: 01.09.2025****OM DEVI AND ANOTHER****..Petitioners****Versus****JITENDER DAHIYA****..Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Dhanda, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harish Nain, AAG, Haryana.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 20.04.2024 passed by this Court in CWP-8729-2024, which is reproduced as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the impugned order dated 28.03.2022/06.04.2022 (Annexure P-24) is factually incorrect as no financial assistance has been paid to the petitioner so far and it has been wrongly been recorded in the said impugned order that the financial assistance amounting to Rs. 14,260 was paid to the petitioner on 8.08.2001. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners intend to approach the concerned authority for the review of the said impugned order which is being factually incorrect, hence, the present petition may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further with liberty as prayed for.”



2. A perusal of above shows that no direction was issued by this Court rather liberty was granted to the petitioners to approach the concerned authority. It further shows that there is no disobedience on the part of any of the respondents, who are made party in the present contempt petition.

3. Despite the fact that there is no violation or disobedience of order dated 20.04.2024 passed by this Court, the present contempt petition is filed, which is not even maintainable. This amounts to gross abuse of the judicial process and contributes significantly to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court.

4. Similar matter has already been dealt with by this Court in **COCP-3579-2025** decided on 24.07.2025 titled as “**Payal Chaudhary V/s KAP Sinha IAS and others**”, while placing reliance on the judgments passed by Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled as “**Dalip Singh V/s State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2010) 2 SCC 114, Subrata Roy Sahara V/s Union of India (2014) 8 SCC 470 and K.C. Tharakan V/s State Bank of India & Ors. Passed in Writ Petition (Civil) Diary No(s).27458/2022**”. The relevant paragraphs of **Payal Chaudhary (supra)** are reproduced as under:-

“9. It is evident that the petitioner has engaged in what can only be described as a frivolous and vexatious litigation spree, seemingly driven by a misplaced sense of grievance. Such conduct constitutes a gross abuse of the judicial process and contributes significantly to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court. The tendency of litigants to misuse the judicial forum by engaging in forum shopping, filing repetitive and meritless petitions, and adopting dilatory tactics undermines the very foundation of our legal system and clogs the administration of justice.



10. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Dalip Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2010) 2 SCC 114***, has cautioned against this emerging category of unscrupulous litigants who, devoid of respect for truth, resort to falsehood and unethical practices in their pursuit of relief. The Supreme Court emphatically held that such litigants, who seek to pollute the stream of justice or who dare to touch the fountain of justice with unclean hands, are not entitled to any relief, interim or final. Relevant extracts of the same is reproduce as under:-

“In the last 40 years, a new creed of litigants has cropped up. Those who belong to this creed do not have any respect for truth. They shamelessly resort to falsehood and unethical means for achieving their goals. Courts have evolved new principles to curb such abuse, and it is now well established that a litigant who attempts to pollute the stream of justice or touches the pure fountain of justice with tainted hands is not entitled to any relief, interim or final.”

11. The petitioner's conduct in instituting frivolous litigation has resulted in a gross misuse of the judicial process, thereby squandering the valuable time and resources of this Court. It is imperative, in the interest of justice, that bona fide and timely claims are adjudicated expeditiously, without being impeded by vexatious and unscrupulous litigation. At this juncture, reference may be made to the pertinent observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Subrata Roy Sahara v. Union of India (2014) 8 SCC 470***, wherein the Court lamented the pervasive malaise of frivolous litigation afflicting the Indian judicial system. The Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:-

“The Indian judicial system is grossly afflicted with frivolous litigation. Ways and means need to be evolved, to deter litigants from their compulsive obsession towards senseless and illconsidered claims. One needs to keep in mind, that in the process of litigation, there is an innocent sufferer on the other side of every irresponsible and senseless claim. He suffers long drawn anxious periods of nervousness and restlessness, whilst the litigation is pending, without any fault on his part.”

12. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has consistently emphasized the need to deter frivolous appeals and petitions by imposing



*exemplary costs on the litigating parties. In Writ Petition (Civil) Diary No(s). 27458/2022 titled as **K.C. Tharakan v. State Bank of India & Ors.** decided on 01.05.2023, the Hon'ble Apex Court held as follows:*

“No legal system can permit a situation wherein a party repeatedly agitates the same issue after it has been conclusively adjudicated by the highest judicial forum. Such conduct amounts to a gross misuse of the judicial process and results in a significant waste of valuable judicial time. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed with costs. However, taking into consideration that the petitioner is a dismissed employee, we deem it appropriate to impose a nominal cost. The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed with costs quantified at ₹10,000/-, to be deposited with the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Welfare Fund, to be utilized for the benefit of the SCBA Library.”

5. In view of the above referred to judgments, this Court is firmly of the opinion that the instant petition constitutes a glaring instance of misuse of the judicial process. It is, therefore, incumbent upon this Court to safeguard the sanctity of judicial proceedings and to prevent their exploitation by unscrupulous litigants. The time and resources of this Court are limited and must be reserved for *bona fide* grievances that merit judicial consideration.

6. As a sequel to above discussion, and with intention of conveying a strong deterrent message, this Court deems it just and proper to impose costs upon the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is dismissed with costs of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) for filing such kind of frivolous contempt. The said amount shall be deposited by the petitioners within a period of two weeks from the date of this order with the Poor Patients Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh.



8. In the event of default in compliance, the amount shall be recovered from the petitioners as arrears of land revenue by the competent authority.

September 01st, 2025

Ayub

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*