HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

D.B. Criminal Contempt Petition No. 6/2026
CNR: RJHC020838312026 | URN: CRLCP / 8U / 2026

In Re-, R/o

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Mr. Sandeep Verma, The Then Managing Director Through Managing Director, Rajasthan State Roadways Transport Corporation Parivahan Marg, Chomu House Head Office, Jaipur
2. Mr. Purushottam Sharma, Managing Director, Rajasthan State Roadways Transport Corporation Parivahan Marg, Chomu House Head Office, Jaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Prakhar Gupta, *Amicus Curiae*
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. R.N. Mathur, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Umang Jain, Adv. and Mr. Rajpal Dhankar, Adv. Mr. Tushar Sharma, Adv.

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SANJAY K. AGRAWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAMEER JAIN

Order

29/10/2026

1. This is a reference made by the Presiding Officer of the Labour Court No.1, Jaipur Metropolitan-II under Section 15(2) read with Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (for short 'the Act of 1971'), alleging commission of criminal contempt by respondents-contemnors, namely, Mr. Sandeep Verma respondent No.1 and Mr. Purusottam Sharma-respondent No.2.

2. The reference arises from a communication dated 24.07.2026 addressed by respondent No.1- Mr. Sandeep Verma, the then Chairman-cum-Managing Director of Rajasthan State

Road Transport Corporation to Mr. Pursottam Sharma, the succeeding Chairman-cum-Managing Director. The said communication brought to the notice of the Labour Court as an explanation in response to the notice dated 15.07.2026 issued to Mr. Verma pursuant to the order dated 30.06.2026 passed by the learned Labour Court. The learned Labour Court vide its order dated 13.08.2026 has characterized the language employed in the communication dated 24.07.2026 as highly despicable, deplorable, contumacious and scurrilous and has concluded that the communication scandalized the Court, undermined its authority and interfered with the administration of justice leading to reference under Section 15(2) of the Act of 1971.

3. This Court on 01.10.2026, requested Mr. Prakhar Gupta learned counsel to assist the Court and make his submissions. Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, he has made his submissions stating that the communication dated 24.07.2026 contains a strong and at places unnecessarily categorical criticism of the order dated 30.06.2026 and further has been submitted that the description of learned Labour Court as a Lower Court is inappropriate and it is ought not to be encouraged as a manner/matter of addressing a judicial forum. It is also submitted that the substantive contents of the communication dated 24.07.2026 when read as a whole, appear principally directed towards contesting the factual and legal basis upon which personal liability was proposed to be fastened upon respondent No.1.

4. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

5. According to learned Amicus Curiae, these are legal and factual grounds of defense available to respondent No.1 to shield himself from personal liability to pay interest to the workman. It is the submission of learned Amicus Curiae that the said letter neither appears to contain allegation that the Presiding Officer acted corruptly, dishonestly, maliciously or with an extraneous personal motive nor does the record indicate that the communication/letter was published in public or circulated for the purpose of diminishing public confidence in the Labour Court. Therefore, the mere use of strong language, including the expression "lower court", cannot by itself satisfy the requirement of Sections 2(c) and 13(a) of the Act of 1971.

6. After hearing learned Amicus Curiae and going through the record, we are of the considered opinion that such a communication 24.07.2026 do not amount to undermining the authority of the Labour Court as it was an internal communication by respondent No.1 proceeded himself from the personal liability to pay interest to the workman concerned.

7. As such, no case for criminal contempt is made out in terms of Sections 2(c) read with Section 13(a) of the Act of 1971. Even otherwise, Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 appeared in advance and tendered their unconditional apology, which appears to have been offered from the core of their hearts. Accordingly, their unconditional apology is also taken on record.

8. Accordingly, the present criminal contempt is closed.

(SAMEER JAIN),J (SANJAY K. AGRAWAL),CJ