

**IN THE COURT OF SH. HEM SINGH, LD. DISTRICT JUDGE-01,  
EAST DISTRICT, KARKARDOOMA COURTS, DELHI**

Misc. DJ 11424/2016

CNR No. DLET01-005511-2015

**In the matter of:-**

**Ankur Mutreja**

R/o Unit I.G.F., 156,  
Gagan Vihar Extension,  
Delhi-110051

.....**Applicant**

Versus

**Patwari, Department of Revenue (East, Delhi**

O/o District Magistrate (East), Delhi,  
L.M. Bund Office Complex,  
Shastri Nagar, Delhi-110051

.....**Non- Applicant**

**14.03.2026**

**ORDER**

a) By way of the present petition, the petitioner has prayed that a reference be made to the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi for initiation of criminal contempt proceedings against the respondent, who is working as a Patwari at Department of Revenue (East) Delhi, on the ground that he allegedly made a false statement before the Court during the course of hearing of appeals preferred by the petitioner against the composite order dated 02.12.2013.

**b)** The brief facts of the petition are that the petitioner had earlier instituted a civil suit against, *inter alia* the SDM (East) Delhi and DC (East) Delhi, seeking permanent and mandatory injunction. In the said suit, the petitioner had also filed four interim applications seeking certain interim reliefs. It is stated that all the four interim applications were dismissed by the Ld. Trial Court vide composite order dated 02.12.2013. Aggrieved by the dismissal of the said applications, the petitioner preferred four appeals before this Court which were registered as MCA no. 24/2013, 1/2014, 2/2014 and 3/2014.

**c)** It is further stated that during the course of arguments in the said appeals, the contemnor appeared before the Court and submitted that the demarcation from the KARKARI MOD to the office of the Sub-Registrar is in progress. According to the petitioner, relying upon the aforesaid statement made by the contemnor, this Court dismissed the appeals of the petitioner while observing that the petitioner had misled the Court by submitting that demarcation was being carried out of the house no. 152 to 156, Gagan Vihar Extn., Delhi.

**d)** The petitioner has averred in the present petition that, as per the official record, demarcation proceedings were carried out only with respect to house no. 152 to 156, Gagan Vihar Extn., Delhi, and no demarcation report as claimed by the contemnor was ever filed on the record. It is thus alleged that the statement made by the contemnor before this Court to the effect that demarcation was being carried out from the KARKARI MODE to the office of the Sub-Registrar was

false and misleading. Hence, the petitioner has sought that a reference be made to the Hon'ble High Court for initiation of criminal contempt proceedings against the contemnor for allegedly making a false statement before the Court.

e) Submissions heard. Record perused. Considered.

f) To decide the instant application, it is necessary to examine the scope and ambit of contempt jurisdiction under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

As per Section 2(c) of the said Act, criminal contempt means the publication of any matter or doing of any act which:-

- scandalises or tends to scandalise, or lowers or tends to lower the authority of any court, or
- prejudices or interferes or tends to interfere with the due course of any judicial proceeding, or
- interferes or tends to interfere with the administration of justice in any other manner.

g) It is settled proposition of law that the power of contempt is extraordinary in nature and is required to be exercised with great caution and only in cases where there is a clear and substantial interference with the administration of justice.

h) In the present case, the allegation of the petitioner is essentially that the contemnor made an incorrect or false statement before the Court regarding the extent of the demarcation proceedings. In

considered opinion of this Court even if the allegations of the petitioner are assumed to be correct, the act complained of would not come under the definition of criminal contempt as defined under section 2(c) of the Act as the same cannot be construed as a deliberate act intended to interfere with or obstruct the administration of justice.

i) If the petitioner was aggrieved by the said findings or observations, the appropriate remedy available to the petitioner was to challenge the said order before the Appellate Court in accordance with law. The contempt jurisdiction cannot be invoked as a substitute for appellate or other statutory remedies.

j) In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the allegations made in the present petition do not disclose any act which may constitute either civil contempt or criminal contempt within the meaning of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Consequently, no ground is made out for making any reference to the Hon'ble High Court for initiation of contempt proceedings against the contemnor.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed being devoid of merit.

File be consigned to the record room.

**Announced in the open court  
On 14.03.2026**

**(HEM SINGH)  
District Judge-01 (East)  
Karkardooma Courts, Delhi**