



COCp-928-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

COCp-928-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 05.03.2026

Sudhir Kumar @ Sudhir Kumar Gupta

..Petitioner

Versus

S. Ravtresh Inderjit Singh

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, Advocate,
for the respondent.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J.

1. Notice of motion.
2. Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, Advocate, has put in appearance and filed his Power of Attorney on behalf of the respondent.
3. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 10.11.2025 passed by this Court in CR-7687-2025, wherein the following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in the present Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a direction to the learned appellate authority, Jalandhar, to decide the application bearing CM No. 674 of 2025 (Annexure P-4) titled Sudhir Kumar vs. Rakesh Kumar (since deceased) through LRs, in Rent Appeal No. 47 of 2025 and CM No. 644 of 2025 (Annexure P-5) titled Sudhir Kumar vs. Rakesh Kumar (since deceased) through LRs pending before the learned Executing Court, expeditiously and preferably in a time-bound manner.

2. Heard.



COC-928-2026 (O&M)

-2-

3. *In view of the innocuous prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the view that issuance of notice to the respondent would unnecessarily delay the proceedings; as such, issuance of notice to the respondent is dispensed with.*

4. *Considering the limited prayer of the petitioner, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to both the Courts below to decide the aforesaid applications expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months. Registry is directed to send a copy of this order to the concerned appellate authority and the Executing Court for compliance.*

5. *Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.”*

4. A perusal of the above shows that the civil revision petition i.e. CR-7687-2025 was disposed of with the direction to both the Courts to decide the applications i.e. CM-674-2025 titled ‘Sudhir Kumar vs. Rakesh Kumar (since deceased) through LRs’, in Rent Appeal No. 47 of 2025 and CM No. 644 of 2025 titled ‘Sudhir Kumar vs. Rakesh Kumar (since deceased) through LRs’ expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in compliance of order dated 10.11.2025 passed by this Court in CR-7687-2025, the application i.e. CM-644-2025 has already been decided by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar, vide its order dated 27.02.2026, still the petitioner has chosen to file the present contempt petition before this Court after the compliance of the order dated 10.11.2025.

6. A bare reading of the order dated 10.11.2025 shows that there is no disobedience on the part of the respondent for which the present



COCp-928-2026 (O&M)

-3-

contempt petition has been filed. Despite having due knowledge of the legal position that the application has been decided and order dated 10.11.2025 passed by this Court has been complied with on 27.02.2026, the petitioner chose to file present contempt proceedings and continued to pursue the same without any justifiable or tenable grounds of law. Such conduct amounts to gross abuse of the process of law and unnecessarily adds to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court.

7. Ordinarily, this Court would have concluded the matter at this stage by dismissing the contempt petition. However, having regard to the underlying intent behind the filing of the present contempt, the manner and mode in which the allegations have been raised against the Judicial Officer, the matter warrants further consideration and elaboration. Such kind of allegation of disobedience of this Court's order against a sincere, competent and hard working Judicial Officer demands indulgence of this Court. As observed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Nirbhay Singh Suliya Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2026 AIR Supreme Court 412** that when false allegations fly thick and fast, the judicial officers cannot react.

8. Further perusal of the order dated 10.11.2025 passed by this Court shows that this Court had directed the courts below to decide the applications expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months. No time bound direction was given by this Court to decide the applications. Therefore, no contempt is made out.

9. Further perusal of the file wherein the petitioner has reproduced the zimini orders shows that because of the non-filing of the reply by the



COCP-928-2026 (O&M)

-4-

respondent, the matter was adjourned and even the cost of Rs.500/- was imposed by granting last opportunity by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Jalandhar, vide its order dated 29.01.2026.

10. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Nirbhay Singh Suliya Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2026 AIR Supreme Court 412**, held that one cannot overlook the reality of ours being a country, wherein countless complainants are readily available without hesitation to tarnish the image of the judiciary, often for mere pennies or even cheap momentary popularity. Sometimes, a few disgruntled members of the Bar also join hands with them, and the officers of the subordinate judiciary are usually the easiest target. It is, therefore, the duty of the High Courts to extend their protective umbrella and ensure that the upright and straightforward judicial officers are not subjected to unmerited onslaught. The relevant paragraphs of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

“27. A fearless judge is the bedrock of an independent judiciary, as much as an independent judiciary itself is the foundation on which rule of law rests. A judicial Officer is tasked with the onerous duty of deciding cases. Invariably one party to the case would lose and go back unhappy. Disgruntled elements amongst them, wanting to settle scores may raise frivolous allegations. The Trial Judiciary also has tremendous work pressure and works under trying working conditions. Large number of cases are listed in a day and most of the Judicial Officers give their very best while discharging their duties.

28. Instances have also emerged from different parts of the country, where not just disgruntled parties but some mischievous elements in the Bar have also resorted to intimidatory tactics against the members of the Trial Judiciary by engineering false and anonymous complaints. Strict and strong



action in accordance with law should be taken against such individuals filing a false and frivolous complaint against a judicial officer and/or if found to be engineering the false and frivolous complaints. Such proceedings would include in appropriate cases, proceedings for contempt of court. In case the person filing or engineering false and frivolous complaints is a recalcitrant member of the Bar, apart from proceedings for contempt of court, reference to the bar council should be made for disciplinary action. Bar councils, on receipt of such references, have to dispose of the matter expeditiously.”

11. 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 officers 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.

12. Accordingly, with a view to sending a strong deterrent message and to preserve the sanctity of judicial officers, this Court deems it appropriate to impose costs of Rs.1,00,000/- upon the petitioner to be paid to the respondent.

13. The said amount shall be deposited with the learned District and Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, who shall disburse the same to the respondent in his account.

14. Consequently, the present contempt petition is **dismissed** with costs of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), payable to the respondent, to be credited in his account.

15. In the event of default in compliance, the amount shall be recovered from the petitioner as arrears of land revenue by the competent authority.
16. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

05.03.2026

Virender

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No