



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

126

COCP-2737-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.05.2026

AJIT SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

GAURAV TOORA SENIOR SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for non-compliance of order dated 25.03.2026 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CWP-9010-2026 whereby the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petition under Section 11 of the Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as ‘Act’) is still pending before the Collector after remand. It is further the contention that till date no proceedings under Section 7 of the Act have been initiated by the Gram Panchayat. However, the Gram Panchayat and its associates have started interfering in the peaceful possession of the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. DAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 4/State and seeks some time to get his instructions. Meanwhile, he assures



the Court that no coercive steps would be taken against the petitioner.

Let notices be issued to respondent Nos.5 to 15 returnable 15.07.2026.”

2. On asking of this Court, Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice and contends that regarding the property in dispute there is a status quo order passed by the Civil Court bearing the signatures of the petitioner as well. Learned State counsel has placed on record the order passed by the Civil Court, the same is taken on record.

3. A perusal of the same shows that petitioner has tried to get the relief under the garb of present contempt petition. 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. It is well settled that contempt jurisdiction is required to be exercised with great caution and circumspection and only in cases where wilful 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.

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.

7. 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.

8. Accordingly, with the objective of sending a strong deterrent message, this Court finds it appropriate to impose costs of Rs.50,000/- upon the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present contempt petition is **dismissed** with costs of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only). The said amount shall be deposited by the petitioner with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association.

10. In the event of default in compliance, the amount shall be recovered from the petitioner as arrears of land revenue by the competent authority.

11. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

May 27th, 2026

Saahil/Ayub

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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