

(2015) 12 DEL CK 0238
In the Delhi High Court
Case No : Cont. Cas.(Crl.) 2/2014

Court on its Own Motion

APPELLANT

Vs

Seema Sapra

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-12-2015

Acts Referred:

Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 — Section 14, 14(1), 14(2), 15, 18

Citation : (2016) 1 AD 1 : (2016) 154 DRJ 185

Hon'ble Judges : Valmiki J. Mehta and P.S. Teji, JJ.

Bench : Division Bench

Final Decision : Disposed Off

Judgement

Valmiki J. Mehta, J.—A Division Bench of this Court vide its Order dated 6.5.2014 issued contempt notice to Ms. Seema Sapra, writ petitioner in W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012. This Order dated 6.5.2014 passed by the Division Bench comprising of Hon"ble Mr. Justice S. Ravindra Bhat and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru reads as under:--

"Upon the Court assembling after lunch today, Ms. Seema Sapra presented herself and accused one of us (Vibhu Bakhru, J.) of corruption. Despite being cautioned, she persisted in leveling the same accusation. The context was constitution of Bench of Hon"ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru which according to Ms. Sapra was done in an improper manner and, to use her own words, "deceptively". The Court was of the opinion, and continuous to maintain the said opinion, that the speech made by Ms. Seema Sapra amounts to criminal contempt in the face of the Court and is punishable under Section 14(1) of the Contempt of Court Act, 1971. Accordingly, the Court required Ms.Seema Sapra to be presented at 04.00 PM. She complied with this request.

Upon being informed that the Court wishes to proceed against her, Ms. Sapra expressed the desire that this Bench should not proceed with the matter and that

she exercises her option under Section 14(2) to have the matter heard by another Bench. The Court hereby issues notice of contempt to Ms. Seema Sapra who is present in Court.

In the light of the above, the following charge is hereby framed:

That today (i.e. on 6.5.2014) at 02:30 PM, you Ms. Seema Sapra have committed contempt on the face of the Court which is punishable under Section 14(1) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 by stating that one of us (Vibhu Bakhru, J.) is "corrupt" and has indulged in deceitful practice of sitting in a Bench with Hon"ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar in an unscheduled manner.

Ms. Seema Sapra was present when the above charge was read out. The matter is directed to be listed before another Bench of which neither of us is a member, subject to the orders of the Hon"ble the Chief Justice, on 26th May, 2014.

All rights and contentions of the alleged contemnor Ms. Seema Sapra are reserved."

2. A reference to the Order dated 6.5.2014 shows that contempt notice was issued to Ms. Seema Sapra (hereinafter referred to as "noticee" or "contemnor") because the noticee stated that Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru is corrupt and has indulged in deceitful practice of sitting in a Bench with Hon"ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar in an unscheduled manner.

3. Before turning to the issue of contempt certain aspects with respect to the main writ petition W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 filed by the noticee have to be noticed. This writ petition, essentially in the nature of a Public Interest Litigation, was filed by the noticee in the year 2012 and the same was ultimately dismissed by this Court vide its Judgment dated 2.3.2015. The last two paras 27 and 28 of the Judgment dated 2.3.2015 dismissing the W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 read as under:--

"27. In view of the above, this writ petition is a totally frivolous and a mala fide petition, and it is also an abuse of the process of the law. The present writ petition was never a genuine PIL and it was only an action of a disgruntled employee who was thrown out of her employment and such a petitioner/employee through this PIL is seeking to take vendetta against her erstwhile employer with whom she has enmity. By the time the judgment in the case was reserved vide order dated 3.2.2015, volumes of the writ petition had reached to number 35 ending at page Nos. 12,440.

28. In view of the above, the various orders passed by this Court, and the wild and reckless allegations made by the petitioner against all and sundry including Hon"ble Judges of this Court and the Supreme Court, the present is a classic case of abuse of PIL process where the writ petition must be and is accordingly dismissed with exemplary costs of Rs. 2 lacs to be deposited within 3 months with the Delhi High Court Legal Aid Services Authority and payment of which costs shall be a condition precedent for the petitioner to initiate any fresh independent litigation on any of the subject matters of the present proceedings.

All pending applications stand disposed of accordingly."

4. The Judgment dated 2.3.2015 in W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 shows that the noticee caused the recusal of as many as 28 Judges of this Court from hearing W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012. This aspect is noted in para 7 of the Judgment dated 2.3.2015. We are stating this fact because even in the present contempt petition when we wanted to hear and dispose of the contempt notice, the noticee on 30.10.2015 asked this Bench to recuse from the matter. Asking Benches to recuse is a habit for the noticee. On 30.10.2015 we declined this prayer of the noticee, as we had also declined the same prayer made for recusal of this Bench from hearing the main W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012. The Order dated 30.10.2015 records the submissions of the noticee as also the request made for recusal of this Bench and initial repeated refusals to argue the contempt petition. This Order dated 30.10.2015 reads as under:--

"1. On 6.8.2015, although there were no reasons for once again allowing the stated contemnor to file the reply to the contempt petition, yet, eight weeks time was again granted, but, this opportunity has not been utilized for filing of the reply. Earlier, orders had been passed on 26.5.2014, 25.9.2014 and 10.11.2014 to file reply but still reply was not filed and consequently last opportunity was granted by the order dated 6.8.2015.

2. It is noted that the grounds were taken during the hearings in this petition of the year 2014 that the stated contemnor had fractured her leg and therefore was seeking time to address arguments.

3. It may also be noted that the main writ petition filed by the petitioner being W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 already stands dismissed by the judgment of this Court dated 2.3.2015.

4. In view of the above, right of the stated contemnor Ms. Seema Sapra to file the reply is closed. Ms. Seema Sapra is directed to address arguments in the case.

5. At this stage, Ms. Seema Sapra, the stated contemnor states that this Court should recuse itself from the matter as this Court had decided the main writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 and dismissed the same as arguments to be addressed by the stated contemnor Ms. Seema Sapra in this petition would also turn on the aspects of merits of the writ petition.

6. In our opinion, once again the request of recusal is a totally frivolous prayer and the same is rejected inasmuch as merits of a decided writ petition has nothing to do with the order dated 6.5.2014 by which contempt was issued against the stated contemnor on account of the respondent/stated contemnor stating that Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru is corrupt. As already noted in the judgement dated 2.3.2015 in the main writ petition such a prayer had caused recusal of around 28 judges of the court from hearing the writ petition. A similar request was also made to this Bench for not hearing the writ petition and that

prayer was rejected by us.

7. Stated contemnor is again directed to commence arguments in terms of the notice issued by the Division Bench of this Court on 6.5.2014.

8. The stated contemnor in spite of being repeatedly pointed out that the limited issue before this Court is the contempt proceedings against the contemnor in terms of the order dated 6.5.2014, however the stated contemnor once again argues about the averments made by her in her writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 and which have no bearing on hearing of this contempt petition.

9. For the last time, the stated contemnor is directed to address arguments limited to the contempt notice issued in terms of the order dated 6.5.2014 of the Division Bench of this Court.

10. The stated contemnor Ms. Seema Sapra has thereafter argued the following aspects:--

(i) The stated contemnor has made a complaint in the year 2014 to the Chief Justice of India, Hon"ble Mr. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan on the ground that Hon"ble Mr. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan had made a statement to the press that persons can make complaints against corruption of Judges.

(ii) It is argued that no one can be a Judge in his own cause and since the issue is of contempt proceedings arising out of a complaint against a Judge of this Court on his being corrupt, i.e., Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru being corrupt, this Court cannot hear the matter otherwise this Court will become a Judge in its own cause. It is also argued that on 6.5.2014, the Bench of Hon"ble Mr. Justice S. Ravindra Bhat and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru i.e., a Bench which had as its member Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru could not have issued the contempt notice on 6.5.2014.

(iii) It is argued that the main writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 was to be heard on 6.5.2014 by the Bench of Hon"ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru and therefore petitioner had gone to enquire from the Court of Hon"ble Mr. Justice S. Ravindra Bhat and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru as to when the matter was to be taken up and it was informed to her that the writ petition would be taken up by the Bench of Hon"ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru after the Bench of Hon"ble Mr. Justice S. Ravindra Bhat and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru completed their Board, however, the stated contemnor found out subsequently that the Bench of Hon"ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar and Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru without assembling had adjourned the W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 to a long date. It is argued that it is in the heat of the moment that the stated contemnor did make the statement that Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru was corrupt, and therefore such actions in the heat of the moment could not be taken as contempt of the Court. It is argued by the stated contemnor that she regrets having made the statement made on 6.5.2014 that Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru was

corrupt.

(iv) Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru was not entitled to be a part of the Bench for hearing W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 inasmuch as Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru was a lawyer of General Electric Company for different years and that in fact the stated contemnor recollects that she had talked about the facts of the W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 on various occasions with Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru as a lawyer in the lobby of this Court.

(v) It is argued that the stated contemnor is being harassed by the police who is seeking to poison her by releasing toxic gas and even today police personnel were harassing her in Court.

11. Arguments heard. Judgment reserved."

5. It is clear that in spite of repeated opportunities given to the noticee since the date when the contempt notice was issued to the noticee vide Order dated 6.5.2014 for the noticee to file her reply to the contempt notice, these opportunities were not utilized by the noticee as noted in para 1 of the Order dated 30.10.2015. Accordingly, the right of the noticee to file reply to the contempt notice was closed by the said Order dated 30.10.2015.

6. Para 10 of the Order dated 30.10.2015 summarizes the arguments which have been urged on behalf of the noticee, and they are the arguments which have to be dealt with by this Court to decide whether to discharge the contempt notice or to hold the noticee guilty of contempt of Court and pass consequential orders against the noticee.

7.(i) The first argument urged on behalf the noticee was that the then Chief Justice of India Hon"ble Mr. Justice K.G. Balakrishnan in the year 2014 had made a statement to the Press that persons can make complaints against corruption of Judges, and therefore when the noticee said that Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru was corrupt and indulged in deceitful practice of sitting in a Bench with Hon"ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar in an unscheduled manner, this stand/statement should not be taken as a contemptuous act as the statement of the noticee is for pointing out corruption and that too as per what was observed by the then Chief Justice of India.

(ii) This argument urged on behalf of the noticee is wholly fallacious because surely a person can make a genuine grievance if a Judge is found to be corrupt, and for this purpose the noticee need not take support from the statement made by the then Hon"ble Chief Justice of India, the issue however is that baseless and reckless allegations made of corruption against the Judges do not justify the allegations made of corruption. Corruption is a very serious charge against the Judge and the institution of Court itself which scandalizes judiciary and interferes or tends to substantially interfere with the due course of justice if the allegation of corruption is unsubstantiated, and in fact not even remotely established. Self serving stands of corruption of Judges, and which have no valid basis, cannot be

a basis that because "corruption" is alleged hence there is liberty to make wild allegations of corruption against judges. The noticee has failed to substantiate in any manner whatsoever the charge of corruption of Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru and therefore, clearly the noticee is guilty of contempt of Court. The responsibility of the noticee is much higher inasmuch as, the noticee is an Advocate who is well versed with the legal procedures and the law. Advocates have higher duties than ordinary litigants with respect to court procedures and contemptuous statements. Clearly, therefore, the first argument urged on behalf of the noticee is without any substance and is rejected.

8.(i) The second argument which was urged on behalf of the notice was that this Court cannot hear the contempt notice, inasmuch as Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru is a Judge of this Court, and therefore, this Court will become a Judge in its own cause.

(ii) This argument urged on behalf of the noticee is also again wholly misconceived because it is not the law that once there is a notice of contempt on account of a totally false and contemptuous statement made by the noticee against one Judge, that other Benches of this Court cannot hear the matter because it would amount to this Court becoming a Judge in its own cause. The argument is too frivolous for this Court even to deal with the same in a detailed manner. Suffice however to say that in fact when contempt is in the face of the Court, the same Judge in whose face the contempt is committed can himself/herself forthwith take notice and issue orders of contempt against the person who is guilty of the contemptuous act vide *Leila David Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others*, . Legislature also has made this clear in the provision of Section 14 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 under which there is no bar from other Benches of the same court from hearing a contempt notice. In fact, by virtue of Section 18 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 a case of criminal contempt is to be heard by a Division Bench only when the criminal contempt is one under Section 15 of the Act, and thus except in cases covered by Section 15 of the Act a criminal contempt can in fact be heard not only by a Single Judge but the same Single Judge in whose face the contempt is committed. The second argument urged on behalf of the noticee is therefore rejected.

9.(i) The third argument urged on behalf of the noticee is essentially that the Bench of Hon''ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar and Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru on 6.5.2014 without assembling adjourned W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 to a long date.

(ii) Even for the sake of argument if we take what is argued on behalf of the noticee in the third argument as correct, the same is not a justification in any manner for calling Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru as corrupt. We have called for the original file of W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 and it is seen on 6.5.2014 that the Bench of Hon''ble Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar and Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru recused from the matter and listed the matter just two days later viz on 8.5.2014, and clearly therefore, the noticee is falsely arguing that a long date was given. These observations are made by this Court, that factually long date

was not given but even assuming if a long date was given, the same is no justification for any litigant or an Advocate to make wild and reckless allegations of a Judge being corrupt.

10. The fourth justification/argument urged is that Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru was not entitled to hear W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 on the ground that Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru was a counsel for the respondent No. 1 company/M/s. General Electric Company and its associated companies. Once again this argument is a totally baseless argument because this stand has not been substantiated upon. Self serving averments made by the noticee of her discussing the facts of W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 are only convenient allegations and this Court completely disbelieves the same. Obviously, the argument of noticee discussing the case with Hon''ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru in the lobby of this Court have been made only to somehow or the other wriggle out of the contempt notice issued by this Court. This argument is also therefore rejected.

11.(i) The last argument urged by the noticee is that she is being harassed by the police who is trying to poison her.

(ii) This Court has really failed to understand as to how police harassing the noticee and making of the allegations by her that she is sought to be poisoned by the police, can in any manner justify noticee from calling a Judge of this Court as corrupt. It is not a justification for a noticee to state that she is calling a Judge of this Court corrupt without any basis whatsoever, and that too simply because the police is allegedly harassing her. In fact, even the charge that the police was harassing the noticee is a wild and unsubstantiated charge against the police and a similar aspect has already been dealt with and rejected vide paras 25 and 26 of the Judgment dated 2.3.2015 in W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012 and these paras read as under:--

"25(i) The second and only other relief, and the second aspect of the writ petition, is with respect to claim of the petitioner for being provided security on the ground that she is a whistle blower. Petitioner in different applications and in the writ petition has claimed security and even Z+ security on account of averments that there are threats to her life. What are the threats to the life of the petitioner we have already reproduced above and which have been noted in different orders passed by different Benches of this Court. Suffice to say that the said/alleged threat to the petitioner's life is nothing but a figment of imagination of the petitioner. None of the neighbours of the petitioner can be said to have tried to poison the petitioner. None of the hospitals and the doctors alleged by the petitioner have also ever tried to poison or kill the petitioner. There is no basis whatsoever in the allegations against Delhi police and some of its personnel trying to kill the petitioner or harass the petitioner. All allegations made by the petitioner are baseless and self-serving allegations which merit total and complete rejection by this Court. In fact, petitioner is not a whistle blower but is a disgruntled ex-employee of the respondent No. 1 and whose services were terminated prematurely and seeing the conduct of the petitioner so far as this

writ petition is concerned, we are sure that G.E. obviously would not have been able to tolerate the employment of the petitioner with it.

(ii) We would also like to note that issues of threat perception and threat assessment are left to the requisite authorities being the Delhi Police and the Ministry of Home Affairs and both these authorities have filed affidavits in this Court that there is no threat perception to the petitioner and we completely agree with the stands taken by the Delhi Police. The relevant paras of the counter-affidavits of the Ministry of Home Affairs and Delhi Police read as under:--

Para 1 of Counter Affidavit dated 14.1.2013 of Ministry of Home Affairs

"1. REPLY TO PARA 1 AND 2: In reply to para 1 and 2 it is humbly submitted by the respondent that provision of security to the petitioner, is the responsibility of the State Government/UT Administration concerned. The local police may provide security, if, as per their local threat assessment, such security is considered necessary. Whereas it is submitted that with regards to the provision of security to whistle Blowers, the Government of India has authorized the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) as the designated agency to receive written complaints for disclosure on any allegation of corruption or misuse of office and recommend appropriate action in respect of employees of the Central Government or of any Corporation established under any Central Act, Government Companies, societies or local authorities owned or controlled by the Central Government. It is further submitted that if CVC is of the opinion that the complainants or the witnesses need protection, it shall issue appropriate directions to the concerned Government Authorities, i.e. Delhi Police, in the instant case. Similarly, for her relocation to a safe house on security considerations, it is for the CVC to take a view as to its necessity and give appropriate directions to the Delhi Police. A copy of Resolution No. 371/12/2002-AVD-III, dated 21.04.2004 and CVC Office Order No. 33/5/2004 dated 17.05.2004 under file No. 004/VGL/26 and its enclosures, is annexed along with and is marked as ANNEXURE A."

Paras 42 and 43 of the counter affidavit dated 11.1.2013 of Delhi Police

"42-43. The contents of para 42-43 are denied except which are specifically admitted hereinunder. Without commenting upon the petitioners apprehension of danger of her life it is submitted that the answering respondent in strict adherence to the order of this Hon"ble high court tried to extend police protection to the petitioner, however on enquiry it was found that the petitioner had been evicted from the tenanted premises at G-4, First Floor, Jungpura Extension in pursuance of the Judgement/decreed dated 27.5.2011 passed by the court of Ms. Neelam Singh, ADJ-II, South, Saket Courts. It is submitted that pursuant to the order of eviction, the owner of the premises had filed an execution in which the bailiff was appointed for taking over the possession of the premises. When the bailiff tried to take the possession the same was resisted by the petitioner leading to seeking of police protection by the owner. The owner

and the bailiff were granted police assistance and the possession of the premises was taken over on dated 30.5.2012. The copy of proceedings leading to recovery of possession of the rented premises from the petitioner are annexed herewith as ANNEXURE-R3/2 (Colly). It is submitted that after the possession of the premises were taken over, the whereabouts of the petitioner could not be ascertained despite attempts being made through enquiry from various bar Association offices. The copy of letter sent to bar association offices are annexed herewith as ANNEXURE-R3/3 (colly). The petitioner has lately sent a complaint through mail to the commissioner of Police regarding grievance of parking at the Indian Habitat Centre. The complaint is being looked into by the Concerned police station and a concerned officer from the police station Lodhi Colony as tried to contact the Petitioner but despite efforts the petitioner couldn't be contacted either due to her unavailability at her room or due to her mobile being switched off. However the concerned official has given strict instructions to the security at the India Habitat Centre and also to the Beat staff of the local police to look after and secure the petitioner. The copy of D.D. entry showing the visit by police official from Police Station Lodhi Colony are annexed herewith as ANNEXURE-R3/4 (colly).

The complaints made till date by the petitioner to the police have been duly enquired into and found to be highly imaginative and/or an exaggerated narration of fact which discloses no cause for apprehension to either her life or person. The allegation of being drugged/poisoned at the house by the neighbour through holes in her tenanted house were enquired and no such hole was found to have existed. Further allegation of poisoning through overhead water tank were also frivolous in as much as there exist a single tank on the top through which water is supplied to all the 3 floors of the rented premises and no such problem was informed by anyone living in the other floors of the building. The petitioner had made numerous complaints however nothing substantial was found in the complaint despite enquiry/investigation by the police officials. It is submitted that the allegation of terrorization/intimidation by the Delhi police are entirely false and frivolous. The allegation of conspiracy by the police to isolate the petitioner are also baseless and ill founded. The allegation of being terrorized by alleged harassment by the police are also baseless."

(emphasis is mine)

26. We completely agree with the stands taken up by the Delhi Police and the Ministry of Home Affairs in this regard. Petitioner in the guise of making allegations of threat to human life has in fact caused misery, harassment and turmoil to innumerable number of people including her neighbours, Delhi Police, doctors and even advocates of this Court. Though it may not be relevant for the purpose of disposal of this writ petition, it may be noted that the petitioner who is an advocate has been restrained from going into the canteens of the lawyers of this Court because petitioner kept on making allegations even against lawyers that lawyers were trying to poison her. Petitioner therefore only has access to

this court as a lawyer for approaching the courts and not for using the areas to which other advocates have access such as canteens etc."

The last argument urged on behalf of the noticee is therefore rejected.

12. Clearly therefore the action of the noticee in calling Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru as corrupt is an act of criminal contempt of this Court. The wholly unsubstantiated statement made against Hon"ble Mr. Justice Vibhu Bakhru scandalizes or tends to scandalize this Court and also lowers and tends to lower the authority of this Court. The contemptuous statement prejudices or interferes or tends to interfere with the due course of judicial proceedings inasmuch as the unsubstantiated contemptuous statement has caused recusal of a Bench of this Court from hearing the matter on 6.5.2015. Clearly, therefore, the noticee is guilty of contempt of Court and this Court finds that her contemptuous statement is of such a nature that it substantially interferes or tends to interfere with the due course of justice.

13. The question which now arises is that what should be the punishment which should be imposed upon the contemnor. Also, in addition to the punishment imposed upon the contemnor should other orders be also passed by this Court against the contemnor.

14. It is no longer res integra that courts have powers in appropriate cases to direct a litigant or an Advocate not to appear in Court for arguing a case vide In Re: Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate, and R.K. Anand Vs. Registrar, Delhi High Court, .

15. The facts of this case show that the contemnor is not in any manner contrite. Contemnor has been seeking to overawe different Benches of this Court and has caused recusal of different Benches hearing the main writ petition W.P.(C) No. 1280/2012. After recusal by 28 Judges of this Court the main writ petition was heard by this Court and dismissed in terms of the Judgment dated 02.03.2015. Petitioner has continued in the same vein even in these contempt proceedings as noted in the Order dated 30.10.2015. As observed repeatedly by the Supreme Court the onus and duty upon an Advocate is much more than an ordinary litigant when addressing a court of law or using the judicial process. We are forced to remark that the contemnor was incorrigible even during the hearings of this contempt petition and this Court in fact had to close the right of the contemnor to file reply to the show cause notice which was not filed over many hearings.

16. In the facts of the present case therefore we hold the contemnor Ms. Seema Sapra guilty of contempt of Court and we impose a punishment on the contemnor of undergoing imprisonment for a period of one month. We also impose a fine of Rs. 2,000/- upon the contemnor to be deposited within a period of three months from today with the Registrar General of this Court failing which the contemnor will undergo a further term of imprisonment of one month. We further direct that the contemnor will not be allowed to argue, whether as an

Advocate or in person, except in her defence, before any Bench of this High Court or any court or tribunal subordinate to this High Court for a period of two years from today. A copy of this judgment be sent to the Registry of this Court and to all subordinate courts and tribunals. A copy of this judgment be also sent to the Delhi Bar Council for information. Contempt notice is disposed of accordingly.

17. We direct that the operative part of this judgment pertaining to imposition of punishment will not operate for a period of three months from today to enable the contemnor to take appropriate steps to exercise her legal remedy.