



COCP-4010-2025

-1-

2026:PHHC:048077



2026:PHHC:048077

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

COCP-4010-2025

Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

PRIYA RANI

.....Petitioner

Vs.

RAVINDER SINGH

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Akhil Dadwal, Advocate (through V.C.)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shikhar Sarin, Advocate for the respondent.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The present contempt petition has been filed for deliberate and intentional disobedience of order dated 24.10.2024 passed by this Court in CRM-M-41157-2024, whereby the following order was passed:-

"1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.69 dated 12.03.2024 under Section 498-A, 406 and 323 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 17.07.2024 (Annexure P-2).

2. The following order was passed on 27.08.2024:-

"The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.69 dated 12.03.2024, registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar under Sections 498-A, 406, 323 IPC on the basis of a



compromise deed (Annexure P-2) executed between the parties.

The parties are alleged to have effected a compromise, as per the compromise deed, dated 17.07.2024 (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Himani Arora, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1-State and seeks time to file reply.

Ms. Kajal Garg Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 and filed her memo of appearance in Court today, which is taken on record and she confirms about factum of compromise between the parties.

Copies of the petition be handed over to learned counsel for the respondents during the course of the day.

The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate up-to 30.09.2024 or recording of their statements. After recording the statements of all the accused, victim, complainant and injured if any, the trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate shall send a report to this Court on the following facts well before the next date of hearing: I. Whether a genuine compromise has been arrived at between all the affected parties

II. Whether the complainant, all the injured/victim and all the accused are party to the compromise?

III Whether during investigation, any additional accused has been added and he/she is a party to the compromise?

IV Whether any accused is a Proclaimed Offender?

V Whether after the registration of the FIR any offence was added or deleted during investigation?

VI Whether investigation is pending against any of the accused or any accused has been declared as innocent.

Adjourned to 24.10.2024 for awaiting the report of the trial Court.

In the meantime, power of attorney of learned counsel for respondent No.2 be filed."

3. In compliance of the aforesaid order, a report has been received from the concerned jurisdictional Court



that the compromise between the parties is genuine and arrived at without any pressure or coercion from anyone.

*4. In view of the compromise and the ratio of law laid down by the Hon ble Supreme Court in **Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466, Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834 and Shakuntala Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63 and Full Bench of this Court in Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052, this petition is allowed and FIR No.69 dated 12.03.2024 under Section 498-A, 406 and 323 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising out of the same are quashed, qua the petitioner.”***

2. A perusal of order dated 24.10.2024 reveals that there is no direction to the respondent. Despite that, petitioner preferred to file the present contempt petition just to harass the respondent. No material has been produced by the petitioner to establish any willful, deliberate disobedience on the part of the respondent. Despite having due knowledge of the legal position, the petitioner chose to file present contempt proceedings and continued to pursue the same without any justifiable or tenable grounds of law. Such conduct amounts to gross abuse of the process of law and unnecessarily adds to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court.



3. Similar matter has already been dealt with by this Court in **COCP-3579-2025** decided on 24.07.2025 titled as “**Payal Chaudhary V/s KAP Sinha IAS and others**”, while placing reliance on the judgments passed by Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled as “**Dalip Singh V/s State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2010) 2 SCC 114, Subrata Roy Sahara V/s Union of India (2014) 8 SCC 470 and K.C. Tharakan V/s State Bank of India & Ors. passed in Writ Petition (Civil) Diary No(s).27458/2022**”. The relevant paragraphs of **Payal Chaudhary (supra)** are reproduced as under:-

“9. It is evident that the petitioner has engaged in what can only be described as a frivolous and vexatious litigation spree, seemingly driven by a misplaced sense of grievance. Such conduct constitutes a gross abuse of the judicial process and contributes significantly to the burgeoning pendency of cases before this Court. The tendency of litigants to misuse the judicial forum by engaging in forum shopping, filing repetitive and meritless petitions, and adopting dilatory tactics undermines the very foundation of our legal system and clogs the administration of justice.

10. The Hon’ble Supreme Court, in **Dalip Singh Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others (2010) 2 SCC 114**, has cautioned against this emerging category of unscrupulous litigants who, devoid of respect for truth, resort to falsehood and unethical practices in their pursuit of relief. The Supreme Court emphatically held that such litigants, who seek to pollute the stream of justice or who dare to touch the fountain of justice with unclean hands, are not entitled to any relief, interim or final. Relevant extracts of the same is reproduce as under:-



“In the last 40 years, a new creed of litigants has cropped up. Those who belong to this creed do not have any respect for truth. They shamelessly resort to falsehood and unethical means for achieving their goals. Courts have evolved new principles to curb such abuse, and it is now well established that a litigant who attempts to pollute the stream of justice or touches the pure fountain of justice with tainted hands is not entitled to any relief, interim or final.”

11. *The petitioner’s conduct in instituting frivolous litigation has resulted in a gross misuse of the judicial process, thereby squandering the valuable time and resources of this Court. It is imperative, in the interest of justice, that bona fide and timely claims are adjudicated expeditiously, without being impeded by vexatious and unscrupulous litigation. At this juncture, reference may be made to the pertinent observations of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Subrata Roy Sahara v. Union of India (2014) 8 SCC 470**, wherein the Court lamented the pervasive malaise of frivolous litigation afflicting the Indian judicial system. The Hon’ble Apex Court observed as under:-*

“The Indian judicial system is grossly afflicted with frivolous litigation. Ways and means need to be evolved, to deter litigants from their compulsive obsession towards senseless and illconsidered claims. One needs to keep in mind, that in the process of litigation, there is an innocent sufferer on the other side of every irresponsible and senseless claim. He suffers long drawn anxious periods of nervousness and restlessness, whilst the litigation is pending, without any fault on his part.”

12. *The Hon’ble Supreme Court has consistently emphasized the need to deter frivolous appeals and petitions by imposing exemplary costs on the litigating parties. In Writ Petition (Civil) Diary No(s). 27458/2022 titled as **K.C. Tharakan v. State Bank of India & Ors.***



decided on 01.05.2023, the Hon'ble Apex Court held as follows:

“No legal system can permit a situation wherein a party repeatedly agitates the same issue after it has been conclusively adjudicated by the highest judicial forum. Such conduct amounts to a gross misuse of the judicial process and results in a significant waste of valuable judicial time. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed with costs. However, taking into consideration that the petitioner is a dismissed employee, we deem it appropriate to impose a nominal cost. The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed with costs quantified at ₹10,000/-, to be deposited with the Supreme Court Advocates-on-Record Welfare Fund, to be utilized for the benefit of the SCBA Library.”

4. In view of the above referred to judgments, this Court is firmly of the opinion that the instant petition constitutes a glaring instance of misuse of the judicial process. It is, therefore, incumbent upon this Court to safeguard the sanctity of judicial proceedings and to prevent their exploitation by unscrupulous litigants. The time and resources of this Court are limited and must be reserved for *bona fide* grievances that merit judicial consideration.

5. The aforesaid judgments clearly emphasize that frivolous and vexatious litigation must be curbed with a firm hand. The repeated filing of meritless petitions not only results in wastage of precious judicial time but also causes unnecessary harassment to public officials, who are constrained to defend themselves despite having acted in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, with a view to send a strong deterrent message and to preserve the sanctity of judicial proceedings, this Court deems it appropriate to impose costs of ₹50,000/- upon the petitioner, to be deposited



with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association, Chandigarh, and the Punjab and Haryana High Court Employees' Welfare Fund, in equal shares, i.e., ₹25,000/- each.

7. Consequently, the present contempt petition is **dismissed** with costs of ₹50,000/- (₹ Fifty Thousand Only), to be deposited with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association, Chandigarh, and the Punjab and Haryana High Court Employees' Welfare Fund, in equal shares, i.e., ₹25,000/- each.

8. In the event of default in compliance, the amount shall be recovered from the petitioner as arrears of land revenue by the competent authority.

9. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

24.03.2026

P. Seth

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No