
(1997) 03 RAJ CK 0029

In the Rajasthan High Court

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous Contempt Petition No. 79 of 1996

Sohan Lal Bothra

APPELLANT

Vs

Ram Narain Arvind and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-03-1997

Acts Referred:

Citation : (1997) 1 RLW 533 : (1997) 2 WLC 461 : (1997) 1 WLN 287

Hon'ble Judges : B.J. Shethna, J; Amaresh Kumar Singh, J

Bench : Division Bench

Judgement

B.J. Shethna, J.—Respondents Thakurmal and Rama Kant have personally remained present before this Court through their learned Counsel Shri Ojha. They have also filed their affidavit. In the affidavit they have stated, "that the contemnors again respectfully and humbly with utmost sincerity submit unconditional apology for the alleged incident and assure the Hon"ble High Court that they will no indulging in any such activity in future. They have highest regards and respects in the mind for the Court of law including subordinate courts and also Hon"ble High Court and Hon"ble Supreme Court." Thus, they have tendered unconditional apology in writing. It appears to us that from their hearts they have tendered the unconditional apology. They are very much repenting about their action. They also assured this Court that in future they will not indulge in such type of activities. Practically for the whole day they remained present in the Court. Hence notice issued against them stands discharged.

2. While parting with the judgment it must be observed that the object of law relating to contempt is to protect the judicial system which caters to the public need for dispensation of justice. In the instant case though in view of the apology tendered by the contemnors we have decided not to pursue the matter any further but it would be proper to make it clear that such conduct poses serious threat to the system of administration of justice because if terrorising the Judicial Officers by assembling in crowd before them, insulting them by various acts, shouting slogans against them for the purpose of obtaining favourable

orders from them is permitted to any extent then we are afraid our leniency would be called as misplaced by the generations to come. If such conduct is repeated by them then the same may be viewed seriously. With these observations this case is disposed of.