



\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1119/2025 and CM APPL. 65436/2025**

SYEED ASIMA ALI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. D N Goburdhun, Senior Advocate with Mr. Hemat Phalpher and Mr Karishmit Keswani, Advocates.

versus

HOCKEY INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajiv. Nayar, Sr. Advocate, Ms. Shyel Trehan, Sr. Advocate, with Mr. Rohan Poddar, Mr Nishikant Singh, Ms. Vidhi Jain, Ms. Manjira Dasgupta, Advocates for R-1 to 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

20.05.2026

1. Heard learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Mr. Bhola Nath Singh, Secretary General of Hockey India is also present in person.
3. The Court, *vide* its judgment dated 20.04.2026, found Bhola Nath Singh guilty of committing contempt of the Court's directions dated 17.01.2025. Liberty, however, was granted to Mr. Bhola Nath Singh to purge the contempt and to undertake such measures as found fit.
4. In terms of the liberty granted by the Court, Mr. Bhola Nath Singh has presented an affidavit of his unconditional apology. Additionally, he has also placed on record the steps taken to recall the minutes of 113th and 114th



Executive Board Meeting, which were held on 04.07.2025 and 25.07.2025 respectively. He has also filed an affidavit of the President of respondent no.1 to substantiate the factum of recalling the said minutes.

5. He thus, contends that his unconditional apology be accepted and the Court may consider not to impose any sentence.

6. Submissions made on behalf of the respondents are strongly opposed by Mr. D N Goburdhun, learned senior counsel for the petitioner. He places reliance on the decisions in the cases of *M.Y. Shareef v. High Court of Nagpur*¹, *Patel Rajnikant Dhulabhai v. Patel Chandrakant Dhulabhai*,² *Mulk Raj v. State of Punjab*³ and *T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad (102) v. Ashok Khot*⁴ to contend that in view of the categorical findings rendered by the Court, the contemnor requires to be adequately sentenced. According to him, the contemnor is not deserving of any sympathetic consideration.

7. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and also perused the record.

8. Section 12 of the Act of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (“Act”) empowers the Court to award punishment for contempt of Court. The said provision reads as under:

“12. Punishment for contempt of court.

(1) Save as otherwise expressly provided in this Act or in any other law, a contempt of court may be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees, or with both:

Provided that the accused may be discharged or the punishment awarded may be remitted on apology being made to the satisfaction of the court.

Explanation.—

¹ (1954) 2 SCC 444

² (2008) 14 SCC 561

³ (1972) 3 SCC 839

⁴ (2006) 5 SCC 1



An apology shall not be rejected merely on the ground that it is qualified or conditional if the accused makes it bona fide.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no court shall impose a sentence in excess of that specified in sub-section (1) for any contempt either in respect of itself or of a court subordinate to it.

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section, where a person is found guilty of a civil contempt, the court, if it considers that a fine will not meet the ends of justice and that a sentence of imprisonment is necessary shall, instead of sentencing him to simple imprisonment, direct that he be detained in a civil prison for such period not exceeding six months as it may think fit.

(4) Where the person found guilty of contempt of court in respect of any undertaking given to a court is a company, every person who, at the time the contempt was committed, was in charge of, and was responsible to, the company for the conduct of business of the company, as well as the company, shall be deemed to be guilty of the contempt and the punishment may be enforced, with the leave of the court, by the detention in civil prison of each such person:

Provided that nothing contained in this sub-section shall render any such person liable to such punishment if he proves that the contempt was committed without his knowledge or that he exercised all due diligence to prevent its commission.

(5) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (4), where the contempt of court referred to therein has been committed by a company and it is proved that the contempt has been committed with the consent or connivance of, or is attributable to any neglect on the part of, any director, manager, secretary or other officer of the company, such director, manager, secretary or other officer shall also be deemed to be guilty of the contempt and the punishment may be enforced, with the leave of the court, by the detention in civil prison of such director, manager, secretary or other officer.

Explanation.—

For the purposes of sub-sections (4) and (5),—

(a) “company” means any body corporate and includes a firm or other association of individuals; and

(b) “director”, in relation to a firm, means a partner in the firm.”

9. It would thus, be clear that upon arriving at a finding of contempt, the Court may award a punishment of imprisonment for a term which may



extend to six months or with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees, or both.

10. First proviso, however, would indicate that the accused may be discharged or the punishment awarded may be remitted on an apology being made to the satisfaction of the Court. The first explanation empowers the Court to consider and accept an apology, if the same is made *bona fide* and should not be rejected merely on the ground that it is qualified.

11. Sub-section 2 of Section 12 of the Act would indicate that notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no Court shall impose a sentence in excess of that specified in sub-section (1) for any contempt either in respect of itself or of a court subordinate to it.

12. Sub-section (3) of Section 12 of the Act provides that where a person is found guilty of a civil contempt, the Court, if it considers that a fine will not meet the ends of justice and that a sentence of imprisonment is necessary shall, instead of sentencing him to simple imprisonment, direct that he be detained in a civil prison for such period not exceeding six months as it may think fit.

13. Having considered the overall conspectus of the facts and circumstances of the case, the Court notes that immediately upon the contemnor being held guilty, corrective measures were undertaken. An unconditional apology, both in Hindi and English, has also been placed on record. The Court further observed the demeanor of the contemnor post conviction and is of the view that, in the facts of the present case, the ends of justice would be adequately met by imposing a fine of Rs. 2,000/- instead of awarding simple imprisonment.



14. Accordingly, the contemnor is sentenced to pay a fine of Rs. 2,000/-, being the maximum punishment that may be imposed by this Court under Section 12 of the Act of 1971. The said amount shall be deposited with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Authority within a period of ten (10) days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

15. With these observations, the instant contempt petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

MAY 20, 2026

Nc