



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

253

COC-1600-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: May 18, 2026

Shakuntala and anr.

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Kabir Chopra

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Praveen Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Abhinav Sood and Mr. Akshay Sharma, Advocates
for the respondent.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for non-compliance of order dated 12.09.2025 passed by Division Bench of this Court in CWP-8425-2025.
2. Learned counsel for the respondent contends that after considering the application of the petitioners, order dated 30.03.2026 has already been passed, which is placed on record in the present petition as Annexure P-2.
3. Despite the fact that order dated 12.09.2025 passed by Division Bench of this Court in CWP-8425-2025 has already been complied with and having due knowledge of the legal position, 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 a gross abuse of the process of law and unnecessarily adds to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court.
4. Normally when there is apparent contempt by the official respondents, this Court imposes costs to be deducted from their salary for non-compliance of the order. The present case is the set example of the litigants, who are in the habit of blaming/targeting the official respondents unnecessarily. A perusal of the file



shows that there is no disobedience by the respondent, rather, he is doing his duties effectively and efficiently.

5. A perusal of the whole file of this case shows that the petitioner has filed the present contempt petition by blaming the official respondent by name. Such conduct amounts to gross abuse of the process of law and unnecessarily adds to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court.

6. It is well settled that contempt jurisdiction is required to be exercised with great caution and circumspection and only in cases where willful and intentional disobedience of an order of the Court is clearly made out. The jurisdiction cannot be invoked to settle scores or to unnecessarily harass officials, particularly when the record reflects compliance with the directions issued by this Court.

7. 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**”.

8. 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.



9. This Court was going to impose cost of Rs.50,000/- upon the petitioners but learned counsel for the petitioners apprised this Court about the financial status of the petitioners, therefore, the same is not imposed.
10. Consequently, the present contempt petition is dismissed.
11. Pending application (s) if any also stands disposed of.

May 18, 2026

Gaurav Arora

**(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No