



COCP-4594-2025

-1-

114

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

**COCP-4594-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.09.2025**

MANMOHAN SINGH AND ORS.

..Petitioners

Versus

SHRI KRISHAN KUMAR AND ANOTHER

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Sushil Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 21.11.2024 passed by this Court in CWP-24584-2015.
2. The relevant portion of the order dated 21.11.2024 is reproduced as under:-

“8. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that after the filing of the writ petitions, now on 29.08.2024, an order has been passed by the respondents that any Junior Assistant, who was in place upto 19.05.1998, they are to be granted the benefit of pay scale of Rs.5000-8100/- and while deciding the claim of the petitioners, who were designated as Junior Assistant though after 01.01.1996 but before 19.05.1998 be also considered in light of the said decision taken by the Government.

9. Learned State counsel submits that while considering the claim of the petitioners, the letter dated 29.08.2024 will also be kept in mind and in case, any petitioner is entitled for the benefit under the said letter dated



COC-4594-2025

-2-

29.08.2024, will also be extended the benefit and appropriate order on the claim of the petitioners will be passed qua their entitlement giving due reasons within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of copy of this order.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present writ petitions may kindly be disposed of having been not pressed any further.”

3. A perusal of the above order shows that no direction is given by this Court, vide order dated 21.11.2024 wherein petitioners themselves have stated that during the pendency of the writ petition, relief was granted and the writ petition was accordingly dismissed as not pressed.

4. This clearly indicates that there has been no violation or disobedience of the Court's order dated 21.11.2024 passed in CWP-24584-2015. Despite having due knowledge of the legal position, the petitioners proceeded to initiate the present contempt proceedings and continued to pursue the same without any justifiable or tenable grounds of law, which is a gross abuse of the judicial process and contributes significantly to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court.

5. 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.”

6. 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.

**COCP-4594-2025****-5-**

7. 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 petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is dismissed with costs of Rs.5,000/- to each of the petitioner (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 Punjab Chief Minister Relief Fund , Account No.001934001000589, IFSC Code: TPSC0000019, Punjab Civil Secretariat 1 Branch.

9. 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 09, 2025*Gaurav Arora***(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned* : *Yes/No**Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*