



COCN-2295-2026 (O&M)

-1-

117

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

**COCN-2295-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 18.05.2026**

Ramesh Singh Ahlawat

..Petitioner

Versus

Sh. A.K.Singh, IAS

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Gaurav Tyagi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J.

1. The contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 19.02.2026 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in LPA-474-2026, whereby the following order was passed:-

“1. Learned Single Judge has refused to interfere in the writ petition filed by the appellant, wherein challenge was laid to a charge-sheet issued to him. The basis of departmental proceedings is a complaint made by a lady against the appellant. Learned Single Judge has refused to interfere in the writ petition for the reasons enumerated hereinafter:-

“Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition. The petitioner has been issued a chargesheet regarding alleged misconduct with the Principal, and there is no material on record to believe the assertions made by learned counsel for the petitioner regarding the complaint being a counterblast, or that the complainant/ Principal himself is guilty of any misconduct against the petitioner. Facts in this regard can be established during the course of inquiry to be conducted pursuant to the chargesheet after



considering the reply, if any, filed by the petitioner. Further, the contention regarding the bar created by Section 13 of the 2013 Act is also not sustainable. It is to the effect that in case allegations against the delinquent have been proved, the ICC or the Local Committee shall recommend to the employer to take action for sexual harassment in accordance with the provisions of service Rules applicable to the respondent. Sub-section (4) to Section 13 further provides that the employer shall act upon the recommendation within sixty days of receipt by him. The provision is directory in nature, requiring the employer to act upon the recommendation. It does not create any absolute bar upon the employer not to take action after sixty days. The argument to the contrary raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is misconceived, and stands rejected accordingly. Besides, the petitioner's sexual misconduct is one of the allegations in the chargesheet and he is accused of misconduct on other counts as well."

2. *Various submissions are advanced on behalf of the appellant primarily to contend that the procedural safeguards contemplated under the Act of 2013 have not been adhered to.*
3. *Learned State counsel opposes the prayer made in the appeal.*
4. *Be that as it may, once the disciplinary proceedings are pending, we find substance in the view of the learned Single Judge that at this stage, no interference in the matter would be warranted as the issues are yet to be gone into, finally, by the disciplinary authority itself. All questions, including adherence to the provisions of the Act of 2013 are also open for the examination at the appropriate stage.*
5. *In such circumstances, we do not find any occasion to interfere with the judgment of the learned Single Judge. We request the disciplinary authority to make all endeavours to conclude the proceedings expeditiously.*
6. *Accordingly, the present appeal is disposed of in light of the observations made hereinabove and is ordered to be consigned to the record.*
7. *Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of."*

**COCp-2295-2026 (O&M)****-3-**

2. A perusal of the order referred to above shows that no specific direction was issued to the respondent. Therefore, no contempt is made out. No material has been produced by the petitioner to establish any willful, deliberate disobedience on the part of the respondent. Despite 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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



COCP-2295-2026 (O&M)

-4-

harass officials, particularly when the record reflects compliance with the directions issued by this Court.

6. 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.”

7. 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.

8. The aforesaid judgments clearly emphasize that frivolous and vexatious litigation must be curbed with a firm hand. The repeated filing of meritless petitions not only results in wastage of precious judicial time but also causes unnecessary harassment to public officials who are constrained to defend themselves despite having acted in accordance with law.

9. Therefore, in the considered opinion of this Court, the time has come when not only deterrent costs must be imposed upon the official respondents but also upon the frivolous litigants. If, in cases of genuine disobedience, costs can be imposed upon officials and recovered from their salaries, there is no reason why, in cases of manifest abuse of process such as the present one, the erring petitioner should not be saddled with exemplary costs payable to the affected officials.

10. Accordingly, with a view to sending a strong deterrent message and to preserve the sanctity of judicial proceedings, this Court deems it appropriate to impose costs of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) upon the petitioner to be paid to the respondent i.e. Sh. A.K.Singh, IAS, Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, Department of Higher Education.
11. The said amount shall be deposited with the Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, who shall disburse the same to the respondent-A.K.Singh in his account.
12. Consequently, the present contempt petition is **dismissed** with costs of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand), payable to the respondent, to be credited in his account.
13. In the event of default in compliance, the amount shall be recovered from the petitioner as arrears of land revenue by the competent authority.
14. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

18.05.2026

Virender

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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