



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

208

COCP-604-2022

Date of Decision: 13.01.2026

M/s Gulf Esfalt Pvt. Ltd.

..Petitioner

Versus

Ajit and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Puneet Jindal, Sr. Advocate
with Ms. Fiza Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for the respondents.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 22.03.2024 passed by this Court in CR-1002-2022, whereby, this Court directed to maintain status quo till 28.03.2022.

2. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the order of status quo was passed on 22.03.2022, and the same was violated by the respondents on the very next day, i.e. 23.03.2022. It is further contended that the petitioner promptly approached this Court by filing the present contempt petition on 24.03.2022. According to learned Senior counsel, the respondents deliberately delayed the proceedings by not filing their reply for nearly three years and, therefore, they should either be directed to purge the contempt by compensating the petitioner or be punished in accordance with law.



3. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the alleged act amounts to violation of order dated 22.03.2022, attracting the contempt jurisdiction of this Court under Sections 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and Article 215 of the Constitution of India.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole file of this case with their able assistance.

5. At the outset, it is necessary to notice that though the contempt petition was filed on 24.03.2022 alleging violation of the interim order dated 22.03.2022, the main civil revision itself was finally heard and allowed in favour of the petitioner on 28.03.2022. Since the civil revision was allowed, therefore, as on date, no contempt is made out and the petitioner has alternate remedy for damages caused to the petitioner.

6. As regards the plea seeking compensation in contempt proceedings, it is settled law that contempt jurisdiction is primarily intended to uphold the majesty and authority of the Court and not to adjudicate disputed questions of fact or grant compensatory relief. The photographs placed on record by the petitioner are admittedly undated, and a mere perusal of such undated photographs is insufficient to conclusively establish wilful disobedience of the order dated 22.03.2022.

7. Moreover, since the civil revision was listed and finally decided on 28.03.2022, it was always open to the petitioner to bring the alleged violation of the status quo order to the notice of the Court hearing the civil revision. No such course appears to have been adopted at the relevant time.

8. Contempt jurisdiction is a matter of grave responsibility and is to be exercised with utmost circumspection. Hon'ble Supreme Court has



consistently held that the majesty of law lies not in punishing, but in forgiving, particularly where the circumstances do not warrant invocation of the Court's extraordinary contempt powers. Reference at this stage can be made to judgment of Apex Court in *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad Vs. Union of India & Ors., 2025 INSC 1344*. The relevant extract of the same is reproduced as under:-

"13. This Court has always said that the majesty of law lies not in punishing, but in forgiving."

9. In view of the above facts and circumstances, and considering that the main civil revision has already been decided, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for contempt is made out.

10. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is dismissed. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to avail such other remedies as may be available to him in accordance with law.

11. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

13.01.2026

Saahil/Ayub

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No