



\$~23

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1509/2025, CM APPLs.72441/2025, 72634/2025
SHANE ALAM AND ANRPetitioners

Through: Mr. Javed Ahmd, Mr. Maroof
Ahmad, Ms. Akriti Adityad and Mr.
Deepanshu Tyagi, Advs.

versus

PRAMILA KUMARI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Vivek Singh and Ms. Kirti
Mewar, Advs. for R-1 along with R-1
in person.
Mr. Sandeep Kapur, Mr. Irfan
Muzamil and Mr. Rahul Agarwal,
Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **12.03.2026**

1. The present petition seeks initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents on account of their scandalous and contumacious conduct, which undermine the authority of this Court and amount to an abuse of the due process of law.
2. The background of the matter is that by an order dated 12.03.2025 passed by this Court in O.M.P.(I)(COMM) 84/2025, the petitioners were restrained from creating any third-party interest with respect to the property bearing no. G-5, South Extension, Part-II, New Delhi-110049, admeasuring 600 sq. yards.
3. The said interim order was continued on the subsequent date of hearing.
4. After obtaining the interim order, the respondents issued a notice in



the Hindustan Times. The said notice is as under:



5. It can be seen that the aforesaid publication has been made under the banner/title “Court Notice”.
6. The manner in which the publication has been made clearly suggests and gives the impression as if the notice has been published at the behest of the Court. The name of the concerned judge has also been prominently mentioned at the foot of the notice, thereby again conveying the impression that the notice has been issued at the behest of the Court itself.
7. On 10.10.2025, this Court also noticed that the notice is designed to



give an impression that the same has been published at the instance of the Court and *prima facie* amounts to an act lowering the dignity and authority of the Court.

8. Learned counsel for the respondent no.1 is unable to dispute/controvert the mischievous conduct on the part of the concerned respondent in issuing the aforesaid notice and the fact that the same has been issued in a manner so as to project that the notice has been issued at the behest of the Court itself.

9. Learned counsel for the respondent no.1, as also the respondent no.1, who is present in Court, tenders an unconditional apology for the said conduct.

10. The respondent no.1 has also filed an affidavit tendering an unconditional apology for the manner in which the publication was made in the newspaper. The said apology is taken on record.

11. The respondent no.1 is cautioned against indulging in such conduct in future.

12. Learned counsel for the respondent no. 1 further submits that to make amends, the said respondent is willing to bear such costs as may be imposed by this Court as acknowledgement of its lapse and as recompense for its conduct.

13. In the circumstances, with the consent of the respondent no.1, it is directed that the said respondent shall pay costs of Rs.7.5 Lakhs to Delhi Legal Services Authority. Let proof of payment of costs be filed within a period of six weeks from today.

14. The concerned newspaper, i.e., the respondent no.2, cannot be absolved for the manner in which the publication has been made.



15. It is noticed that the newspaper itself has made the publication under the caption “Court Notice”.

16. The newspaper cannot be absolved of its obligation to at least conduct a basic verification of the publication that is sought to be made in its newspaper, particularly when the same is done under the caption “Court Notice”.

17. It is evident that the respondent no.2 cannot be completely absolved of its responsibility on account of the publication, which admittedly lowers the dignity of the Court.

18. An affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondent no.2 wherein it has been stated that the lapse on the part of the newspaper was an inadvertent oversight.

19. The affidavit also tenders an unconditional apology for the publication of the notice, affirming that it is at variance with the actual order.

20. Learned counsel for the respondent no.2, while reiterating the apology, undertakes to bear such costs as may be imposed by this Court on account of the lapse on the part of the newspaper.

21. In the circumstances, it is directed that the respondent no.2 shall pay costs of Rs.1 Lakh to Delhi High Court Staff Welfare Fund. The bank account details are as under:-

- *Name of Account:- Delhi High Court Staff Welfare Fund*
- *Account No:-15530110074442*
- *Bank:-UCO Bank, Delhi High Court Branch*
- *IFSC Code:- UCBA0001553*
- *Branch:-Delhi High Court, Shershah Road, Delhi, New Delhi-110001.*

22. The arbitral proceedings are pending before the arbitrator.



23. Needless to say, all issues pertaining to the substantive controversy shall be decided by the arbitrator.

24. No further orders are required to be passed in the present petition. The same is, accordingly, disposed of.

MARCH 12, 2026/cl

SACHIN DATTA, J