



\$~14

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

CNR No. DLHC010252062025

+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 5/2025**

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Harsh Prabhakar, Adv.
(*Amicus Curiae*) with
Mr.Dhruv Chaudhry,
Mr.Shubham Sourav, Mr.Vijit
Singh, Advs.

versus

SANJUCTA KABASI, ADVOCATE

.....Respondent

Through: In person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **13.08.2026**

1. The learned *Amicus Curiae* has rightly pointed out that in our order dated 27.03.2026, while framing the charges against the respondent herein, and though the same was part of the reference, we have not framed the charge against the respondent with reference to the contents of her application dated 17.02.2025 filed by the respondent before the learned Judicial Officer, making scandalous remarks.
2. We have perused the contents of the said application, specifically paragraph 3 thereof, and *prima facie* find the same to be scandalous.
3. Accordingly, we frame the following additional charge against the respondent:



“3. That you, in paragraph 3 of your application dated 17.02.2025 made the following scandalous remarks against the Judicial Officer, thereby undermining the authority of the court and causing prejudice to the judicial proceedings, and therefore, committed criminal contempt of court:

“3. That the court has made this habit of building pressure on the applicant/accused (an advocate of 10 years of standing practice) and her family to complete its deposition as soon as possible against the accused persons in other cross -FIR No. 188/2019 and to secure the same the court is misusing its powers and issuing arrest warrants in a regular manner. Whereas the court is giving all soils of liberty and cooperation in delaying the evidence of the complainant in the present case by giving extended dates. The court is not taking any coercive action against the complainant accused persons Manju and Minakshi and repeatedly marking their attendance behind the back on the influence of their counsel Yogi Pahal. That in this regard a complaint has also been lodged with the Hon’ble High Court of Delhi in their vigilance department which is in process.””

4. As the respondent pleads not guilty to the above additional charge, the respondent is granted an opportunity to file a response to this additional charge within a period of four weeks from today.

5. List on 21st September, 2026.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

AUGUST 13, 2026/Arya/pb