



\$~17

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3954/2024**

HARITA SUNIL PARAB & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Simar Chugh, Petitioner in person

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC for State with SI Arvind Kumar Saini, P.S. Geeta Colony

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

14.02.2025

1. The matter has been mentioned out of turn.
2. Petitioner No. 1 appears in person and seeks an adjournment on ground that she has to attend another matter before the High Court of Bombay and has a train to catch this evening.
3. This Court has perused this petition and prima facie finds that the frame of the petition is not correct and as many as 25 prayer clauses have been pleaded.
4. Petitioner no. 1 states that an amendment application has been filed for amendment of the application to withdraw reliefs.
5. No amended application is listed before the Court, despite time having been sought for this purpose on 18.12.2024.
6. It is made clear that no adjournment will be sought on the next date



of hearing.

7. Mr. Tyagi, learned ASC is directed to ensure that the Investigating Officer (I.O.) is present in Court on the next date of hearing. He states Petitioner no. 1 has no locus to file the present petition and the petition is not maintainable.

8. List on **26.05.2025**.

9. This Court is constrained to make an observation that in the last 7 minutes Petitioner No. 1 instead of addressing the Court has entered into a quarrel with the learned ASC. Repetitively, Petitioner No. 1 has emphasized the fact that she is a woman and she is being disrespected by the learned ASC.

10. This submission of the Petitioner that there was any insult or harassment directed at her by the learned ASC is incorrect. Even the decorum of the Court has been compromised by Petitioner No. 1 by her irreverent conduct.

11. The Petitioner is cautioned to maintain the dignity of the Court and not to create a spectacle in this Court, especially considering that she is an enrolled advocate and is presumed to be experienced in conducting court proceedings.

12. After this order has been dictated, the Petitioner no. 1 has now continued with her rant against the Bench as well and has walked out of the Court continuing the rant. It is extremely unfortunate that Petitioner No. 1 has failed to maintain any decorum.

13. The Petitioner no. 1 is cautioned that if she continues with such unacceptable behavior, this Court will be constrained to initiate appropriate proceedings against her. Being a woman or being an enrolled advocate does



not give any added advantage to Petitioner no. 1 to quarrel or rant in Court.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J
FEBRUARY 14, 2025/mt/MG
Click here to check corrigendum, if any