



COCP-6136-2025 (O&M)

-1-

240

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

**COCP-6136-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.02.2026**

Manpreet Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Dr. Ankur Gupta and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present : Mr. Kiranpreet Singh Sidhu, Advocate, (through VC)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet S. Joshi, DAG, Punjab,
for the respondents.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (ORAL)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 30.07.2024 passed by the Division Bench of this Court in CWP-2066-2018, whereby the following directions were issued by this Court:-

8. *In view of the above, it would be appropriate to dispose of the present petition with the following directions:-*

- i) State of Punjab is directed to ensure that whenever a complaint is made which reflects commission of cognizable offence, an FIR ought to be registered in terms of the law laid down by the Apex Court in Lalita Kumari's case (supra).*
- ii) The provisions of the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994 be followed in its letter and spirit."*

2. In compliance of the order dated 30.07.2024 passed by the



COC-6136-2025 (O&M)

-2-

Division Bench of this Court in CWP-2066-2018, compliance affidavit dated 22.01.2026 of Ankur Gupta, IPS, Senior Superintendent of Police, District Ludhiana (Rural) has been filed on behalf of respondent No.1 before the Registry. The same is taken on record.

3. The relevant extract of the compliance affidavit dated 22.01.2026 is reproduced as under:-

“4. That on the perusal of the record, the following points have come on record, which are stated herein below for the kind perusal of this Hon’ble Court:-

I. That at the very outset, one Nirmal Singh @ Sembey submitted a representation before the office of the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), which was endorsed with No. 628150 (PGD No. 628962) dated 28.07.2025. In the said representation, it was alleged that fraud had been committed by Manpreet Kaur (present petitioner), who is an employee of AXIS Bank. It was alleged that Nirmal Singh @ Sembey opened a bank account in AXIS Bank bearing Account No.922010064882853 through Manpreet Kaur, and that she fraudulently updated her own mobile number i.e. 97796-73528 and her Gmail account in the said bank account. By using her mobile number linked with the account, ATM cards, and cheque book by forging her signatures, she withdrew a total amount of Rs. 51,29,280/-.

That an inquiry was conducted on the said representation and, during the course of inquiry, the present petitioner Manpreet Kaur joined the inquiry on 29.07.2025. During the inquiry, she herself admitted that she had used the funds of Nirmal Singh @ Sembey lying in his bank account without his consent. She further admitted that she had linked her own mobile number with the aforesaid bank account. That later on, on 12.08.2025, Nirmal Singh @ Sembey recorded his statement, wherein he stated that the present petitioner Manpreet Kaur had undertaken to return



the amount withdrawn by her without his consent. On the basis of the said statement, Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe, has withdrawn the aforesaid representation.

II. That the present petitioner Manpreet Kaur submitted a representation before the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Ludhiana (Rural), which was endorsed with No. UID 642041 dated 15.08.2025. The said representation was marked to the Station House Officer, Police Station Women, Ludhiana (Rural), for conducting an inquiry.

That during the course of inquiry, on 18.08.2025, the statement of the present petitioner was recorded, wherein she alleged that Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe came to India on 18.06.2025 and that on 17.06.2024, the present petitioner, along with the driver of Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe, went to Amritsar to receive him from the airport. She further alleged that she had booked a hotel room for them. She further stated that Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe, the present petitioner, and the driver stayed in one room, and alleged that Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe attempted to forcibly establish physical relations with her. It is pertinent to mention here that the statement of the driver, namely Jatinder Singh @ Billa, was recorded, wherein he stated that no such incident, as alleged by the present petitioner, ever took place in his presence.

Thus, the inquiry was conducted on the basis of the above-said representation, the record, and the technical and documentary evidence available. The Report No. 742/5A dated 22.09.2025 was prepared by the Station House Officer, Police Station Women, Ludhiana (Rural), wherein it was found that the dispute between the present petitioner and Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe pertained to the withdrawal of Rs. 51,29,280/- from the bank account of Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe. It was found that the present petitioner had fraudulently linked her own mobile number i.e. 97796-73528 by forging signatures and transferred money from the bank account of Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbe with the



clear intention to commit fraud. The present petitioner failed to produce any witness or evidence to substantiate the allegations leveled by her. Consequently, it was recommended to consign the representation to the record room, as no police action was required.

III. That thereafter, another representation was submitted by Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbeey before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), which was endorsed vide No. 4901-Peshi dated 21.08.2025. In the said representation, it was alleged that the present petitioner committed fraud by forging his signatures on cheques and misappropriated a huge amount from his bank account without his consent. The said representation was marked to CIA Ludhiana for conducting the inquiry.

IV. That another representation was submitted by the present petitioner before the office of the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), endorsed vide No. 6386-OP dated 11.11.2025, wherein it was stated that Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbeey was repeatedly harassing her and that the CIA Staff, Jagraon, was assisting him. She requested that the inquiry be transferred from CIA to an impartial police officer not below the rank of Superintendent of Police.

V. That thereafter, another representation was submitted by Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbeey before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), endorsed vide No. 6661-Peshi dated 27.11.2025, reiterating allegations that the present petitioner had forged his signatures and misappropriated a huge amount from his bank account without his consent.

VI. That representation was submitted before the office of the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), by the authorized signatory of AXIS Bank, namely Sonu Kumar Nath, which was endorsed vide No. 29/R dated 08.01.2026. In the said representation, it was stated that the present petitioner committed fraud upon Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbeey, holder of Savings Bank Account No. 922010064882853, since 18.04.2025. It was



further stated that she inappropriately transferred funds by forging the signatures of Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbey on three cheques and routed her personal transactions without the knowledge or consent of the customer.

Thus, the deponent, i.e. the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), after examining the entire record, clubbed representation No. 6386-OP dated 11.11.2025 submitted by the present petitioner, representation No. 4901-Peshi dated 21.08.2025 and representation No. 6661-Peshi dated 27.11.2025 submitted by Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbey, and representation No. 29/R dated 08.01.2026 submitted by the authorized signatory of AXIS Bank. All the said representations were marked to the Superintendent of Police (Investigation), Ludhiana (Rural), for conducting an inquiry, which is presently under consideration.

VII. That it is pertinent to mention that Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbey has also submitted various representations before AXIS Bank through E-mails in regard to the misappropriation of funds from his account bearing Account No. 922010064882853 by forging his signatures and routing personal transactions without his consent.

Consequently, AXIS Bank, taking coercive action, suspended the present petitioner with effect from 24.09.2025.

VIII. That on the other hand, after the preliminary inquiry, the FIR No. 19 dated 21.01.2026, under Section 420,406,465,467,468,471 IPC, Police Station City Jagraon was registered against Manpreet Kaur.

IX. That the contention of the present petitioner that FIR should have been registered as per the order dated 30.07.2024 passed by this Hon'ble Court in furtherance with the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in "Lalita Kumari Vs. State of U.P." is being misinterpreted because of the peculiar facts of the case. In fact, the preliminary inquiry conducted till date and the facts that have come on record, clearly shows that the present petitioner Manpreet Kaur is the one who has committed a fraud with the alleged accused Nirmal Singh @



Sehmbey and after the compromise with him, she has disobeyed the conditions of compromise and has leveled allegations of rape upon her by Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbey. The petitioner wants to take the benefit of the judgment in a total abusive manner, especially in absence of any clear statement by her with regard to the time and place of occurrence. On the verification of the facts, the petitioner has failed to bring on record the hotel in which Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbey has allegedly forced physical relations with her within a short period of time in a hotel, when a driver accompanying them went to have a bath for few minutes. The petitioner has further failed to pin point the name of the hotel at Amritsar and other important details. In absence of such important facts and concealment on the part of the petitioner, especially in light of the fraud committed by her upon Nirmal Singh @ Sehmbey, the factum of forced physical relation becomes suspicious and doubtful on the face of it.

4. A perusal of the above shows that there is no disobedience on the part of the respondents for which the present contempt petition has been filed. 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.

5. 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



COCP-6136-2025 (O&M)

-7-

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, they are doing their duties effectively and efficiently.

6. 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 a gross abuse of the process of law and unnecessarily adds to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court.

7. 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.

8. 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.”

9. 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.

10. 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.



COCP-6136-2025 (O&M)

-11-

11. 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.

12. 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.50,000/- upon the petitioner to be paid to the respondents i.e. Dr. Ankur Gupta, IPS, SSP, Ludhiana (Rural) and Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Sub-Inspector, SHO, Police Station Women, Jagraon, in equal shares.

13. The said amount shall be deposited with the Department of Home, Punjab, which shall disburse the same to the respondents i.e. Dr. Ankur Gupta and Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, in their accounts.

14. Consequently, the present contempt petition is **dismissed** with costs of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only), payable to the respondents, to be credited into their accounts.

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.

17.02.2026	(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
Virender	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No