
(1998) 01 AP CK 0033
In the Andhra Pradesh High Court
Case No : C.A. No. 1 of 1997

A.T.M. Rangaramanujam

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Andhra Pradesh

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 21-01-1998

Acts Referred:

Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 — Section 14

Citation : (1998) 1 ALD 797 : (1998) CriLJ 1169

Hon'ble Judges : T. Ranga Rao, J;B. Subhashan Reddy, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Mr. A. Panduranga Rao, for the Appellant; Advocate-General, for the Respondent

Judgement

B. Subhashan Reddy, J

1. This Contempt Appeal is directed against the Order dated 29-1-1997 arising out of Criminal Petition No. 107 of 1997 and of a suo motu contempt case.

2. The appellant is a senior Advocate practicing since last about 40 years. In a bail petition, certain material papers were filed, which it seems, in some respects do not tally with the original material papers. The material allegation against the appellant was that as a Counsel for the accused in the bail petition he has not placed before the Court the matter written on the overleaf of the remand report giving the details of the seized property and only when the Court wanted, later the same was filed and after the Court found that the copy of the Panchanama, which was filed along with the bail petition, did not tally with the full papers filed on 18-1-1997, the explanation of the appellant was that whatever papers handed over by the person, who instructed him to file the bail petition, he had filed the same believing them to be true and as such, endorsed as true copies. But, when the contempt proceedings were initiated, the appellant had tendered unconditional apology stating that it was a mistake. This unconditional apology was accepted by the learned Judge. But, the learned Judge went further and administered a warning to the appellant and cautioned him not to repeat any

such interference with the administration of justice in the future.

3. We have heard the learned Advocate General.

4. We are of the considered view that having accepted the unconditional apology, the matter ought to have been stopped there and the learned Advocate General is also of the similar view.

5. In the circumstances, we expunge the remarks of the learned single Judge contained in his Order dated 29-1-1997 in Criminal Petition No. 107. of 1997 "... than administering a warning to him and cautioning him not to repeat any such interference with the administration of justice in the future.""

6. Accordingly, the Contempt Appeal is disposed of No costs.