

(2013) 11 SC CK 0031

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Suo Motu Campt. Petition (Criminal) No. 9 of 2013 in Writ Petition (C) No. 26 of 2012

**In Re: News Item Published in Indian Express (The Sunday Express)
Dated 22.09.2013 Titled "V.K. Singh.... Attacks SC's Decision on his Age Row"**

Date of Decision : 20-11-2013

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2013) 14 SCALE 378

Hon'ble Judges : R.M. Lodha, J;H.L. Gokhale, J

Bench : Division Bench

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

1. In response to the notice issued pursuant to the order dated 01.10.2013, a reply is filed by the Contemnor No. 1 - General V.K. Singh (Retd.). In the reply, inter alia, it is stated as follows: ...I fully respect the Constitution of India as also the institutions created by it. I have the highest respect for the Judiciary particularly this Hon"ble Court.... I hereby tender an unqualified apology.

Mr. Ram Jethmalani, learned senior counsel appearing for the Contemnor No. 1, states that the Contemnor No. 1 withdraws the entire statement concerning Judiciary made by him in Hindi and English to Asia News International (ANI) on 21.09.2013. Learned senior counsel further states that the Contemnor No. 1 also withdraws all other statements made by him with regard to this Court in earlier interviews after the order of this Court dated 10.02.2012.

2. The Contemnor No. 1 - General V.K. Singh (Retd.) is personally present. Mr. Ram Jethmalani, learned senior counsel, made the above statements in his presence.

3. The apology is tendered by the Contemnor No. 1 - General V.K. Singh (Retd.) at the earliest possible opportunity without contesting the notice at all. The apology tendered by him appears to us to be bona fide. We accept the same.

4. Contemnor No. 2 - Ramesh Chander Malhotra - in response to the notice has

filed his affidavit on 17.10.2013. In the affidavit, Contemnor No. 2 has stated as follows:

...I again on behalf of the Indian Express and my own behalf offer my unqualified complete sincere apology....

5. We accept the apology tendered by Contemnor No. 2.

6. Although in our order dated 23.10.2013, we had indicated that we would like to hear Mr. F.S. Nariman, learned senior counsel for the Contemnor No. 2 on diverse issues that may arise for consideration in the Contempt Petition but now since both contemnors have tendered unqualified and unconditional apology, we do not think any further hearing in the matter is necessary.

7. We, accordingly, discharge the notice and drop the contempt proceedings. Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No. 22248 of 2013 for intervention is rejected.