Through e-mail/WhatsApp

OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE (SOUTH-WEST)
DWARKA DISTRICT COURTS, NEW DELHI

No. 2078-812 /Judl./DWK/2026 Dated: 15.05.2026

Sub: Reg. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for dealing with Disruptive Conduct & Contempt of Court.

As directed by the Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (S-W), Dwarka Courts, a copy of letter No. 2924-2936/DHC/Gaz./SOP/2026 dated 13.05.2026, on the above-mentioned subject, alongwith a copy of Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for dealing with Disruptive Conduct & Contempt of Court, prepared by the Delhi Judicial Academy, received from the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, New Delhi, is forwarded herewith for kind information as were approved as a training module and not to be treated as any binding directions and may be used for reference/guidance only, to:

1. All Ld. Judicial Officers posted at South-West District, Dwarka Courts.
2. The Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate (S-W), Dwarka Courts.
3. The Ld. Full Time Secretary, DLSA (S-W), Dwarka Courts.
4. The In-charge, General Branch, Facilitation Centre, Dwarka Courts *(for information)*.
5. The In-charge, Computer Branch, Dwarka Courts *(for uploading the present communication on the webpage of District Courts, Dwarka)*.
6. The In-charge, R&I Branch, Dwarka Courts *(for uploading the present communication on LAYERS)*.
7. PS to the Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge (S-W), Dwarka Courts *(for information)*.

(Balwant Rai Bansal)
Officer In-charge (Judicial Branch)/
District Judge (Commercial Court)-02,
Dwarka Courts, New Delhi.

Dispatch No 2113 Date 14/05/26

HIGH COURT OF DELHI, NEW DELHI

No.2924-2936/DHC/Gaz./SOP/2026 Date: 13-05-26

To,

1. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, (HQ), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
2. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, West, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
3. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, South, Saket Courts, New Delhi.
4. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, South East, Saket Courts, New Delhi.
5. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, South West, Dwarka Courts, New Delhi.
6. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, North, Rohini, Delhi.
7. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, North West, Rohini, Delhi.
8. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, New Delhi, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.
9. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.
10. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, North-East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.
11. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge, Shahdara, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.
12. The Pr. District & Sessions Judge–cum Spl. Judge (PC Act /CBI), RACC, New Delhi.
13. The Principal Judge, Family Courts (HQ), Dwarka Courts, New Delhi.

Sub: Reg. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for dealing with Disruptive Conduct & Contempt of Court.

Sir /Madam,

I am directed to forward herewith the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for dealing with Disruptive Conduct & Contempt of Court for circulation amongst all the Judicial Officers.

2. These SOPs were prepared by the Delhi Judicial Academy and were approved as a training module and thus be not treated as any binding directions and may be used by the Judicial Officers for reference / guidance only.

Yours faithfully,

(Mukesh Gupta)
Joint Registrar (Gaz.II-A)
for Registrar General

Encl.: As above

Endst. No. DHC/Gaz./SOP/2026 date:

Copy forwarded to the Director (Academics), Delhi Judicial Academy, Sector-14, Dwarka, New Delhi-110078 – for information.

(Dr. Ritu Dhirania)
Deputy Registrar (Gaz. II-A)

~~Court~~ Branch
Judicial
for necessary action.

Principal District & Sessions Judge
(SW), Dwarka Courts
Date 14.5.26

INDEX

Sl. No.	Content	Page No.
1.	Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Dealing with Disruptive Conduct and Contempt of Court.	**1-5**
2.	Convicted Cases and not guilty cases under The Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 **(Annexure 'A')**.	**6-29**
3.	Disruptive Acts Constituting Criminal Offences and Relevant Legal Provisions **(Annexure 'B')**.	**30**
4.	Suggested format for Contempt Reference under Section 15(2) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 **(Annexure 'C')**.	**31-32**

Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Dealing with Disruptive Conduct and Contempt of Court

1. Introduction

Judicial Officers in District Courts often encounter challenging situations caused by advocates, litigants, or other persons. These incidents, may at times, amount to Contempt of Court. This SOP is intended to guide Judicial Officers on managing such disruptions both during physical and virtual hearings - and on initiating contempt proceedings when necessary.

Decorum of the Court is to be maintained by all present in physical as well as virtual hearing. As per Rule 3(ii) of the Delhi High Court Video Conferencing Rules, 2021, all participants are required to adhere to the protocols specified in Schedule I. Any serious unwarranted disturbance may result in proceedings being declared *non-est* by the Presiding Judge. Rule 3(iii) affirms that provisions applicable to physical court proceedings—including the CPC, BNS, BNSS, BSA Contempt of Courts Act, and the IT Act—apply equally to virtual hearings.

2. Judicial Conduct and Responsibilities

2.1 Canon of Judicial Ethics

As provided in Rule 10, Part 'F', Volume IV of the Delhi High Court Rules, the Court is expected to be courteous to all, especially young and inexperienced counsel. Simultaneously, the Court is also expected to enforce civility and decorum among clerks, court officers, and advocates.

Rule 11 of the same guidelines empowers the Court to correct unprofessional conduct. If an adverse comment proves insufficient, the matter should be reported to the Hon'ble High Court without delay.

3. Nature of Disruptive Incidents

Not all disruptions may amount to contempt. However, based on past experience and judicial precedents, the following acts are commonly encountered:

- Allegations, especially those of bias and corruption, levelled against the court.
- Defiance of lawful directions and disruptions of court proceedings.
- Outbursts or threats following an unfavorable order.
- Threats of physical harm or actual violence towards judges, litigants, lawyers, or staff.
- Damage to court property.
- Stalking the judicial officer, maligning the officer by scandalous posts on social media and extending threats outside the court.

As per Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, Criminal Contempt includes acts that:

- Scandalize or tend to scandalize the authority of any court.
- Prejudice or interfere with judicial proceedings.
- Obstruct the administration of justice.

An analysis of judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and various High Courts—provided in **Annexure 'A'**—helps distinguish between actions constituting contempt and those which do not.

4. Initial Response by the Presiding Officer

The Presiding Officer must evaluate every situation objectively. Emotional or heated reactions, such as shouting or crying, may not by themselves constitute contempt unless they fall under the statutory definition.

4.1 De-escalation Guidelines

In the event of an aggressive or disruptive act which has not reached the threshold of contempt, the Presiding Officer should:

- Remain Calm: Avoid emotional reactions and refrain from arguing.
- Listen Actively: Understand the concerns of the individual.
- Show Empathy: Acknowledge the person's emotions without validating inappropriate behavior.
- Offer Reassurance and Solutions: De-escalate the situation by suggesting alternatives or clarifying the legal position.
- Maintain Composure: Adopt a confident, non-aggressive posture.

If the issue is not resolved with the above mentioned measures and it escalates to a situation of contempt, the Presiding Officer should warn the person concerned and remind that a reference for criminal Contempt of Court could be made. If the person concerned realizes the mistake and tenders a genuine apology, the court may consider closing the matter. However, if the act amounts to gross contempt which cannot be condoned, the court should initiate the process for making a reference of contempt to the Hon'ble High Court.

As for the incidents that take place outside the court, as mentioned above, a complaint can be made to Hon'ble High Court through Ld. Principal District and Session Judge for passing necessary directions such as injuncting the erring person, giving direction to take down offensive posts, directions for providing security of the officer concerned and to take action under The Contempt of Courts Act, if criminal contempt of the court is made out.

5. Procedure for Making a Contempt Reference

Contempt references must be made in accordance with The Contempt of Courts (Delhi High Court) Rules, 2025:

- Rule 5(2)(c): The High Court may take cognizance of contempt upon a reference from the District Court under Section 15(2) of the Act.
- The reference should be made without undue delay.

Rule 8: Reference Procedure

- Sub-rule (1): The reference must contain particulars as per Rule 7(1)(a) and (b), including:
- Names and addresses of petitioner and alleged contemnor.
- Nature of the contempt and relevant facts including date(s).
- Sub-rule (2): All supporting documents or attested copies must be transmitted.
- Sub-rule (3): References (other than those from the Principal District & Sessions Judge) must be routed through the Principal District & Sessions Judge to the Registrar General of the High Court.
- Sub-rule (4): The Registrar shall register the case and list it before the Court.

6. Documentation and Record Maintenance

All adverse conduct should be properly recorded in the Court's order sheet. If resolved with an apology, it must also be documented in the order. In case, the apology is not tendered or tendered but found to be not genuine or tendered but not accepted by the Court considering the gravity of the act or tendered but withdrawn at a later stage, the same should also be recorded and appropriate action may be taken against the person concerned, including a reference for contempt, if the same is made out.

- Where detailed documentation is necessary, a separate incident sheet should be prepared. A brief note should also be made in the main order sheet.
- Preservation of CCTV footage from inside and outside the courtroom should be requested.
- In VC matters, recording of the session and IP address identification through the IT branch should be obtained.

While recording, it is essential to document the actual words used and a factual narration of the conduct in the order sheet or the separate incident sheet as deemed appropriate by the presiding officer. If the exact words used or gestures made are such that the presiding officer does not deem appropriate to record in the order sheet, such utterances or conduct may be recorded in a separate incident sheet and the same may be kept in a sealed cover with the record.

In case the erring person does not disclose his identity or the same is not known at the moment, efforts have to be made to establish the identity as it will be required if a contempt reference has to be made. To establish the identity, the CCTV footage can be seen. Enquiry from the staff of the court as well that of other courts can also be made. Assistance of the Bar may also be taken, if required.

7. Additional Course of Action – Criminal Offences

In some cases, the incident may also amount to a criminal offence under relevant provisions of law such as Sections 72, 73, 75. 79, 121, 124, 132, 170, 194, 195, 221, 223, 224, 228, 232, 238, 241, 242, 267, 292, 324, 351 and 355 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. (List of offences is annexed herewith as **Annexure 'B'**)

A glaring example of the same is the incident which led to the filing of a contempt petition by a female judge whose modesty was insulted in open court by an advocate while he acted contemptuously and aggressively in open court. An FIR was also registered under relevant provisions of The Indian Penal Code, 1860. The said case resulted in conviction of the accused and the sentence was upheld by Hon'ble High Court in Sanjay Rathore v. State (NCT of Delhi)[1]. Hon'ble Supreme Court also upheld the judgment of Hon'ble High Court.

As per law, offences under Sections 221, 223, 228, and 267 require a formal complaint from the officer concerned or their administrative superior which in the context of Judicial Officers would mean the Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge concerned. When an incident involving offences under BNSS is reported to the Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge along with a contempt reference or without it, Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge may decide whether the situation warrants registration of a FIR and may act accordingly. Normally registration of FIR should be avoided if it makes the presiding Judicial Officer a witness. If grave cognizable offences are committed during the court proceedings which lead to intervention by the police, they will register a case and proceed in accordance with law.

- Damage to Property: If court property is damaged, the Presiding Officer must report the incident to the Principal District & Sessions Judge, who may decide whether a criminal case should be registered and / or a criminal contempt reference should be made.
- Violence in the court room between lawyers, litigants etc: assaulting a fellow Lawyer or a litigant in the court would amount to a criminal offence and also a criminal contempt of Court. In this regard reference can be made to the case of Amit Chanchal Jha v. Registrar, Delhi High Court[2]. In such situation the Court may make the

[1] 2025 SCC OnLine Del 3719, CRL.REV.P. 128/2024
[2] (2015)13 SCC 288

reference of contempt. The aggrieved party may also initiate appropriate criminal proceedings independently.

In violent or threatening situations, where there is a real apprehension of harm:

- The Courtroom must be secured with the assistance from staff.
- Immediate communication should be made with the Principal District & Sessions Judge.
- Police assistance should be requested from the local Chowki Incharge.

8. Draft Format of Contempt Petition

An indicative draft format for a contempt petition is annexed with this SOP as **Annexure 'C'**.

Annexure 'A'

Convicted Cases under The Contempt of Courts Act, 1971				
Sr. No.	**Case Title**	**Alleged Contemptuous Act**	**Held**	**Punishment**
1.	R.K. Garg, Advocate v. State Of Himachal Pradesh, AIR 1981 SC 1382	An advocate, upset by the dismissal of his client's case, threw a shoe at the judge in open court, hitting him on the shoulder. He then escaped custody and evaded arrest, preventing immediate legal action.	The Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the decision of Hon'ble High Court. The court observed that, no doubt, that the Bar and the Bench are an integral part of the same mechanism which administers justice to the people. Many members of the Bench are drawn from the Bar and their past association is a source of inspiration and pride to them. It ought to be a matter of equal pride to the Bar. It is unquestionably true that courtesy breeds courtesy and just as charity has to begin at home, courtesy must begin with the Judge. A discourteous Judge is like an ill-tuned instrument in the setting of a courtroom. But members of the Bar will do well to remember that such flagrant violations of professional ethics and cultured conduct will only result in the ultimate destruction of a system without which no democracy can survive.	Simple imprisonment for six months is reduced to a period of one month and the fine of Rs. 200 is enhanced to Rs. 1000.
2.	Delhi Judicial Service	A Police Inspector lured the Chief Judicial Magistrate (CJM) to the police station,	Hon'ble Supreme Court held the appellants guilty of contempt and observed that	Police Inspector: six months simple

	Association v. State of Gujarat (AIR 1991 SC 2176)	where the CJM was allegedly forced to drink alcohol, assaulted, handcuffed, tied with a rope, and publicly humiliated. His photographs were taken and published in newspapers.	this incident is not a case of physical assault on an individual judicial officer, instead it is an onslaught on the institution of the judiciary itself. The incident is a clear interference with the administration of justice, lowering its judicial authority. Its effect was not confined to one District or State, it had a tendency to affect the entire judiciary in the country. The Hon'ble Supreme Court also issued Guidelines in case of arrest or detention of Judicial Officers. Court also observed that *"We do not approve CJM's conduct in visiting the Police Station on the invitation of Police Inspector Sharma. In our opinion, no Judicial Officer should visit a Police Station on his own except in connection with his official and judicial duties and functions. If it is necessary for a Judicial Officer or a Subordinate Judicial Officer to visit the Police Station in connection with his official duties, he must do so with prior intimation of his visit to the District & Sessions Judge."*	imprisonment and Rs. 2,000 fine. Sub-Inspector: five months simple imprisonment and Rs. 2,000 fine; one month's further imprisonment in default. Head Constable: two months simple imprisonment and Rs. 500 fine; fifteen days further imprisonment in default. Constable: two months simple imprisonment and Rs. 500 fine; fifteen days further imprisonment in default. Mamlatdar: two months simple imprisonment and Rs. 1,000 fine; one months further imprisonment in default. District Superintendent

				of Police: one months simple imprisonment and Rs. 1,000 fine; fifteen days further imprisonment in default.
3.	M.B. Sanghi, Advocate v. High Court Of Punjab And Haryana And Ors , AIR 1991 SC 1834	An Advocate at Narnaul, was representing the plaintiff in Civil Suit titled *Hari Ram v. Municipal Committee* who orally prayed for ex-parte ad:interim stay and the said request was declined by the Subordinate Judge, on the ground that the question of ad-interim stay would be considered after filing of the reply by the defendants and adjourned the case for four days. It appears that the appellant was not satisfied with this order passed by the Subordinate Judge and commented- *"You are wholly favouring the Municipal Committee. Are you sitting as Judge or as Administrator of Municipal Committee? To me it seems that your are deciding the case as Administrator of Municipal Committee. You are acting as, if you are a contractor of the Municipal Committee. I do not expect any justice from you. I do not think that you will grant stay to me as you are fully siding with the Municipal Committee. You are not granting stay to me as you are*	The Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the decision of Hon'ble High Court on the ground that appellate first denied having used the words and then stated that: *"That if this Hon'ble Court comes to the conclusion that the deponent has committed contempt, the deponent tenders an unqualified apology to this Hon'ble Court and begs for forgiveness. The deponent is a senior and respected member of the Narnaul Bar besides that being law abiding citizen has greatest respect and regards for the judiciary and all the Presiding Officers."* Supreme Court further observed that "Moreover in the present case, it has been found that this was not the first occasion in which proceedings for contempt of court had been initiated against the appellant and on an earlier occasion also proceedings for contempt of court had been initiated against the appellant in	Sentenced to pay Rs. 1,000 as fine and in case of default in payment of fine to undergo simple imprisonment for seven days.

		in collusing with the Deputy Commissioner and under his (Deputy Commissioner) influence, you do not want to grant stay to me and that he will complain against me to the Hon'ble High Court."	pursuance of a report of Shri K.K. Chopra, the then Chief Judicial Magis- trate, Narnaul and in those proceedings the rule issued against the appellant was discharged on his tendering un- qualified apology before the High Court. In those proceed- ings also the appellant is said to have made disparaging remarks against the Judge. Keeping in view the said circum- stance, the High Court has found that the appellant was addicted to using contemptuous language and making scurri- lous attacks on judges. Having regard to the fact that incidents of insubordination and use of improper language towards the judges are on the increase, the High Court was of the view that the appellant could not be allowed to get away by simply feeling sorry by way of apology as the easi- est way. I am unable to say that the High Court was not justified in taking this view. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the appellant, a fairly senior advocate, is prone to use dispar- aging and contemptuous remarks against judges, I am of the opinion that this is not a case in which the apology ten- dered by the appellant may be accepted."	
4.	Bansi Dhar and Another v. Registrar, High Court of	Article in weekly newspaper containing scandalizing remarks about court.	Convicted.	Six Months simple imprisonment with fine of Rs 1000 and

	Punjab and Another 1992 SCC (Cri) 417			Editor of paper Sentenced to four months Simple Imprisonment with fine.
5.	Court on its Own Motion v. H.L. Sehgal, MANU/DE/0632/1997	Used abusive, derogatory, and scandalous language against judges in pleadings and during court proceedings; made imputations questioning judicial integrity. The respondent made a contemptuous statement declaring: *"Para 11: I shall do this, with the names of Judges who have passed silly, irrelevant, funny, wrong senseless orders even of dozen atleast. High Court and Supreme Court Judges, within one month, those will he filed in this case, before publication to check its correctness from record, for which surely application will be moved. To make the Hon'ble Judges realise who is the cause of scandalising the administration of justice in India some have already been filed in other files of Contempt of Court still pending (Cr. Contempt No. 4/87, in regular list with two more, including one by me against Shri (name of the Judge omitted) ADJ. I will be moving*	The respondent was held guilty of criminal contempt under Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, for making abusive and scandalous allegations against judges and counsel in pleadings and court, which undermined public confidence in the judiciary. The Hon'ble High Court emphasized its duty to protect subordinate judicial officers from intimidation to preserve the integrity and independence of the justice system.	Simple imprisonment for two months and fine of Rs. 2,000; sentence suspended for one year subject to good behaviour and execution of personal bond.

		that all are consolidated, if not done on oral submission. Because the same thing has been said by me there also...Each word of my remarks about the ability of Judges is 100% documentary fact or can be proved by putting the matter before any sensible person. Many comments on the orders of High Court and Supreme Court Judges are already on lower Court record and filed in pending contempt cases. Many more will be filed within one month, covering the orders passed by my lord... Now when only documents are reproduced, and the orders on those petitions as written are published, who will not laugh at the ability of superior judges even, NOW WHO IS SCANDALIZING ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE MY SELF OR SUCH JUDGES, who are violating their oath? I want, that my Rashatr justice is not condemned by the world, by pointing out, the performance of the Courts."[3]		
6.	In Re: Nand Lal Balwani (1999) 2 SCC 743	An Advocate shouted slogans and hurled a shoe towards the Court causing interference with judicial proceedings and did not even tender an apology,	The Court held that the advocate was liable for contempt in the face of the Court. It was observed by the Bench of three Judges which heard the matter that law does not give a lawyer, unsatisfied with the result of	Four months simple imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 2,000 was imposed.

3 *Sic.*

			any litigation, licence to permit himself the liberty of causing disrespect to the Court or attempting, in any manner, to lower the dignity of the Court. It was also observed that Courts could not be intimidated into passing favourable orders.	
7.	S.K. Sundaram (2000 SC) MANU/SC/0807/2000	The contemnor, an advocate, sent a telegraphic communication to Dr. Justice A.S. Anand, the then Chief Justice of India (CJI), demanding he step down from office due to alleged falsification of his age and threatening criminal proceedings and a writ of quo-warranto. Subsequently, the contemnor filed a criminal complaint against the CJI in the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate's Court, Madras (Chennai), alleging offences under various sections of the Indian Penal Code, including cheating and falsification of records, claiming the CJI had usurped office after attaining the age of superannuation and caused financial loss to the exchequer.	The impugned action of the contemnor was held to be with a defiant and mala fide attitude, a case of gross criminal contempt of court because vilification of the high personage of Chief Justice of India would undermine the majesty of the court and dignity of this institution.	Six months of simple imprisonment. However, sentence suspended for five years on giving undertaking for not committing or even attempting to commit criminal contempt in view of his being heart patient.
8.	In Re: Arundhati Roy v. Unknown AIR 2002 SC 1375	Appellant had previously criticized the Hon'ble Supreme Court's decision in the Narmada Bachao Andolan case. Later, she published a statement outside the Court in response to a notice of contempt served on her and	Hon'ble Supreme Court held the appellant guilty of contempt and held comments were an attempt to scandalize the judiciary and undermine public confidence in the institution.	One day simple imprisonment and Rs. 2000 fine.

		two others. This statement was the focus of the contempt case. The controversial statement read (as cited in the judgment): *"On the grounds the judges of the Supreme Court were too busy, the Chief Justice of India refused to allow a sitting judge to head the judicial enquiry into the Tehelka scandal, even though it involves matters of national security and corruption in the highest places.* *Yet when it comes to an absurd, despicable, entirely unsubstantiated petition in which all the three respondents happen to be people who have publicly - though in markedly different ways - questioned the policies of the government and severely criticized a recent judgment of the Supreme Court, the Court displays a disturbing willingness to issue notice.* *It indicates a disquieting inclination on the part of the court to silence criticism and muzzle dissent, to harass and intimidate those who disagree with it. By entertaining a petition based on an FIR that even a local police station does not see fit to act upon, the Supreme Court is doing its own reputation and credibility considerable harm.* *In conclusion, I wish to reaffirm that as a writer I have right to state my opinions and beliefs. As a free citizen of India I have the right to be part of any peaceful dharna,*		

		demonstration or protest march. I have the right to criticize any judgment of any court that I believe to be unjust. I have the right to make common cause with those I agree with. I hope that each time I exercise these rights I will not dragged to court on false charges and forced to explain my actions."		
9.	In Re: Jagmohan Parashar v. Unknown MANU/MP/0053/2007	After hearing the sentence, the accused Jagmohan started abusing the Judge and took out his both the sandals which he was wearing and hurled them towards the Judge, which fell on dias. At the time of this incident, the Judge was on dias.	The Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh held the appellant guilty of contempt. Court held *"we do not see any justification of the aforesaid conduct of the respondent, which was totally unwarranted, unscrupulous and cannot be ignored merely on the ground of tendering the apology."*	Three months simple imprisonment and Rs. 1000 fine; in default of payment of fine, further one months simple imprisonment.
10.	Leila David v. State of Maharashtra & Ors. AIR 2010 SC 862.	One of the petitioners had gone to the extent of saying that the *"Judges should be jailed for having initiated proceedings against them and that the Judges should be punished for not taking care of their fundamental rights."* One of the writ petitioners, namely, Dr. Sarita Parikh, went to the *extent of throwing a footwear at the Judges.*	Matter was directed to be placed before Hon'ble The Chief Justice of India and on the same day the Hon'ble Chief Justice constituted a Bench comprising the Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.N. Agrawal (as His Lordship then was), the Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.S. Singhvi and the Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.L. Dattu. Section 14 of the Contempt of Courts Act no doubt contemplates issuance of notice and an opportunity to the contemnors to answer the charges in the notice to	Punishment of three months simple imprisonment.

			satisfy the principles of natural justice. However, where an incident of the instant nature takes place within the presence and sight of the learned Judges, the same amounts to contempt in the face of the Court and is required to be dealt with at the time of the incident itself. This is necessary for the dignity and majesty of the Courts to be maintained. When an object, such as a footwear, is thrown at the Presiding Officer in a Court proceeding, the object is not to merely scandalize or humiliate the Judge, but to scandalize the institution itself and thereby lower its dignity in the eyes of the public. In the instant case, after being given an opportunity to explain their conduct, not only have the contemnors shown no remorse for their unseemly behaviour, but they have gone even further by filing a fresh writ petition in which apart from repeating the scandalous remarks made earlier, certain new dimensions in the use of unseemly and intemperate language have been resorted to further denigrate and scandalize and over-awe the Court. This is one of such cases where no leniency can be shown as the contemnors have taken the liberal attitude shown to them by	

			the Court as licence for indulging in indecorous behaviour and making scandalous allegations not only against the judiciary, but those holding the highest positions in the country. The writ proceedings have been taken in gross abuse of the process of Court, with the deliberate and wilful intention of lowering the image and dignity not only of the Court and the judiciary, but to vilify the highest constitutional functionaries.	
11.	O.P. Sharma v High Court of Punjab & Haryana AIR 2011 SC 2101.	On 11.09.1999, during a remand proceeding, Advocate L.N. Prashar hurled abuses and threats at a Judicial Magistrate. Later, about 15–20 advocates, including senior advocate O.P. Sharma, entered the courtroom, shouted slogans, used filthy language, threatened the judge, and nearly assaulted him. The advocates acted in a group to pressurize the judiciary. "You dismiss this bail application. I have no faith in your Court. I am not going to furnish any bail bonds. There is no need for us to have any bail from your Court." "What can your CJM do. You may call him as well. We will	The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that abusing, threatening, and intimidating a Judicial Magistrate in court amounted to criminal contempt under Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Emphasizing the advocate's duty to uphold court dignity and professional ethics, the Court condemned such behavior as undermining the justice system. However, considering the unconditional and genuine apologies tendered at all stages, and invoking the proviso to Section 12(1), the Court accepted the apologies as an exception and discharged the contemnors from their sentence, while reiterating that freedom of expression must be	N.A.

		see your CJM also. You are indulging in big gangism." "We will do like this only. Lock his Court and raise slogans against him.... On the asking of Shri O.P. Sharma, Advocate, other Advocates accompanying him raised slogans, "RAKESH SINGH MURDABAD, RAKESH SINGH MURDABAD..... ....."	exercised with responsibility and respect toward the judiciary.	
12.	Chandra Prakash Singh Chauhan v. State of U.P. and Ors. MANU/SC/0768/2011	The contemnor, Shri Chandra Prakash Singh Chauhan, an advocate practicing in the Civil Court at Mainpuri. He while appearing before the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, used abusive, unparliamentary and uncalled for language, when the Court was dealing with Criminal Case No. 3926/1998 titled State v. Devesh Kumar and Ors. on Crl. A. No. 1202/2006 25th September, 2004, at about 1.10 p.m. According to the advocate, he had moved an application under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and wanted the matter to be heard and orders passed thereupon immediately. When the Court advised that he could wait for a while and the matter could be kept for sometime and dealt with, the counsel became angry and started shouting and used the following undesirable words:	Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the decision of Hon'ble High Court. The language at the face of it was held to be unparliamentary and, in fact, was not expected of an officer of the court to be spoken to.	Sentenced him to imprisonment of four months and to pay a fine of Rs. 2,000, in default of payment of fine, to further suffer simple imprisonment for two weeks.

		"Maine tere tatha tere tamam magistrate ki prati likhtt shikayaten ki hain, tere zila judge ki bhi shikayat ki hai, tera zila judge mere shikayat per ghar baith gaya hai, too is liye mera yah prathana patra nistarit nahin kar raha hai, saale nauaa teri aukat nahin hai, too mera prathana patra jan bujhkar take up nahi kar raha hai".		
13.	Vishram Singh Raghubanshi v. State Of U.P. AIR 2011 SC 2275	In the present case the appellant was advised that he should ask questions peacefully to the witness on which the appellant *stepped over dias of the court and tried to snatch the paper* of statement from the presiding judge and started abusing him that "*Madarchod, Bahanchod*, and stepped out, abusing similarly from the court room.	Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the decision of Hon'ble High Court on the ground that apology tendered by the appellant had neither been sincere nor bona fide and thus, not worth acceptance and then stated that: "The appellant instead of yielding to the court honestly and unconditionally advanced a well guarded defence by referring to all the facts that led to the incident. Apology tendered by the appellant gives an impression that the same was in the alternative and not a complete surrender before the law. Such attitude has a direct impact on the court's independence, dignity and decorum. In order to protect the administration of public justice, we must take action as his conduct and utterances cannot be ignored or pardoned. The appellant had	Three months simple imprisonment with a fine of Rs.2,000.

			no business to overawe the court."	
14.	Arun Kumar Yadav v. State of Uttar Pradesh through District Judge AIR 2013 SC 319	The alleged contemponour used abusive/unparliamentary language and made threatening utterances against the Judge and interrupted him in his official work by shouting loudly.	Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the decision of Hon'ble High Court.	Simple imprisonment for one month and fine of Rs. 2000.
15.	Amit Chanchal Jha v. Registrar High Court of Delhi MANU/SC/1207/2014	On 13th January, 2012 the contemnor allegedly abused a lady advocate during the judicial proceedings before an Additional District Judge, posted as Joint Registrar in the High Court. The Joint Registrar noticed that the lady lawyer was crying and she said that she was slapped by the Appellant. The Appellant also complained that he was also slapped.	Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the decision of Hon'ble High Court. The conduct of the contemnor had caused interference with the judicial procedure and obstructed the administration of justice and was contumacious. The Appellant appeared to be accustomed to use of brute force which was antithetic to the procedure established by law. Such incidents could lead the young advocates shying away from the court. Accordingly, the Appellant was convicted for criminal contempt	Hon'ble High Court of Delhi: Contemnor was convicted for criminal contempt and was punished to undergo imprisonment for seven days and asked to do pro bono legal aid work for the inmates of the jail. He was debarred from appearing in any court in Delhi for three months and the matter was directed to be reported to the Bar Council of India for taking appropriate action.

				Hon'ble Supreme Court: Set aside the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi only to the extent of direction to refer the matter to the Bar Council of India
16.	Mahipal Singh Rana v. State of Uttar Pradesh MANU/SC/0730/2016	During the court proceedings the contemnor threatened and intimidated the Civil Judge (Senior Division) Etah. While interrupting judicial proceedings he angrily said, "how dare you pass an order against my client. No Judicial officer has the courage to pass an order against me. I will not let you live in Etah and I can do anything to you. I am well connected with highly notorious criminals and I can cause harm through them".	Hon'ble High Court found him to be guilty of repeated acts of criminal contempt that had caused nuisance and obstruction to the administration of justice at the Judgeship at Etah, thereby leading to substantial interference with the due course of justice.	Hon'ble High Court :- Two months of imprisonment and fine of Rs.2000, debarred from appearing in any court in District Etah. Hon'ble Supreme Court :- Conviction upheld. Sentence suspended on account of advanced age. Under Section 24A of the Advocates Act, 1961 the

				enrollment of the Appellant was suspended for two years. As a disciplinary measure for proved misconduct, the licence of the Appellant remains suspended for further five years.
17.	Rakesh Tiwari, Advocate v. Alok Padey, CJM (2019) 6 SCC 465	Appellant, on 21-12-2012 during lunch hour without talking permission from CJM, Allahabad, entered into his chamber along with 2-3 colleagues and started hurling filthy abuses to the CJM and he also raised his hand to beat the Chief Judicial Magistrate and also threatened him of dire consequences. The contemnor also asked the CJM as to why he had not passed an order for lodging FIR when he had asked for the same.	Hon'ble Supreme Court held that this act on the part of the contemnor constitutes criminal contempt within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, as this act has not only lowered the authority of the Court but also scandalised the Court and the same has also the tendency of interference with the due course of administration of justice.	Hon'ble High Court:- simple imprisonment of six months and file of Rs.2000. Restrained from entering the premises of District Judgeship, Allahabad for a period of six months and kept under watch for a period of two years. Hon'ble Supreme Court :- The sentence of imprisonment

				of six months was suspended for further period of three years, subject to his maintaining good and proper conduct with a condition that he shall not enter the premises of the District Judgeship Allahabad for a further period of three years in addition to what he has undergone already. Fine of Rs.2000.
18.	M. Victim v. State of NCT of Delhi and Ors. MANU/DE/2897/2022	In this case, the appellant, through her counsel, made a series of serious, scandalous, and contemptuous allegations against several Judges of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and subordinate judiciary in her criminal appeal and connected filings. The allegations included claims of bias, favouritism towards the accused, procedural impropriety, and deliberate miscarriage of justice. The appellant accused a sitting Hon'ble High Court Judge of personally favouring the accused, acting in a whimsical and arbitrary manner, and attempting to manipulate trial	The Court found that the statements made in the appeal were not merely critical but scandalous, deliberately aimed at undermining the authority and dignity of the judiciary. The petitioner made serious and unfounded allegations against several judges, including claims of bias, favoritism toward the accused, and illegal conduct, which the Court found to be malicious and unsupported by evidence. These imputations went beyond fair criticism and were seen as a calculated attempt to scandalize the Court, shake public faith in the justice system, and obstruct the	Respondent handed over an affidavit of unconditional apology for mistake committed and verbally tenders his unconditional apology for his conduct. The apology was accepted.

		court proceedings by calling for reports and delaying decisions. She further alleged that the trial was being conducted in a biased court setting, not presided over by a Lady Judge as mandated by the Supreme Court, and that multiple judicial officers—including the District and Sessions Judges and even the Registrar General—were actively or covertly working to secure the acquittal of the accused. The petition went so far as to suggest a judicial conspiracy and questioned whether the victim could receive a fair and impartial trial in Delhi at all. Despite being asked by the Court to amend or withdraw these scandalous remarks, the counsel declined, insisting that the statements were factual and supported by documents.	administration of justice. Holding that such conduct clearly falls within the scope of "criminal contempt" under Section 2(c)(i) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, the Court emphasized that while criticism is permitted, attacks based on distortion or misrepresentation with the intent to vilify judges cannot be tolerated in a constitutional democracy. Accordingly, the Court issued a contempt notice to the appellant's counsel, directing him to show cause why contempt proceedings should not be initiated.	
19.	Shikha Kanwar v. Rajat Kanwar. MANU/DEOR /83459/2023	The Respondent has used abusive language and made allegations that the Counsel for the Petitioner had engaged in extortion as also interfered with the Court proceedings by calling the Counsel by various unpleasant names. Even after having agreed to pay the sum of Rs.15 lakhs, today, on the face of the Court, the Respondent has stated that even if he gives the cheque, the same would not be encashed and the cheque would bounce back.	Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the decision of Hon'ble High Court. The manner in which the Respondent has behaved clearly constitutes criminal contempt on the face of the Court, as it leads to scandalising the Court and interfering with the course of justice and in the judicial proceedings. The behaviour of the Respondent is clearly contemptuous.	Ordered him to apologize in open court to the ld. counsel for the Petitioner and pay Rs. 1 lakh as costs to the Petitioner.

Not held guilty under The Contempt of Courts Act, 1971				
Sr. No.	**Case Title**	**Alleged Contemptuous act**	**Held**	**Punishment**
1.	Brahma Prakash Sharma And Others v. The State of Uttar Pradesh AIR 1954 SC 10	On 20 April 1949, the Executive Committee of the District Bar Association, Muzaffarnagar, passed a confidential resolution criticizing two judicial officers—Judicial Magistrate, and Revenue Officer—for alleged incompetence, discourtesy, and irregular conduct in judicial proceedings. The resolution was adopted in a closed-door meeting of the Bar Executive Committee and was marked confidential and sent to four superior executive authorities, including the District Magistrate and the Chief Secretary. The resolution states— *"Resolved that ----Whereas the members of the Association have had ample opportunity of forming an opinion of the judicial work of Sri Kanhaya Lal, Judicial Magistrate, and Shri Lalta Prasad, Revenue Officer, It is now their considered opinion that the two officers are thoroughly incompetent in law, do not inspire confidence in their judicial work, are given to stating wrong facts when passing orders and are overbearing and discourteous to the litigant, public and the lawyers alike. Besides the above-mentioned defects common to both of them, other defects are separately*	The Hon'ble Supreme Court acquitted the appellants and held that even if the content was contemptuous, it amounted only to technical contempt. There was no real threat to the administration of justice. Since the resolution was confidential and not publicly disseminated, the potential to undermine public confidence in the judiciary was minimal. Court observed that though the language was harsh in parts (e.g., calling judges "incompetent"), the intent was not malicious.	The Hon'ble Supreme Court set aside the Hon'ble High Court's conviction. (Hon'ble Allahabad High Court, held the appellants guilty of contempt of court; and although the apology tendered by the appellants was accepted, they were directed to pay the costs of Rs. 300 to the respondent State.)

		catalogued as hereunder:- ** * * * (The complaints against each of the officers separately were then set out under specific heads). Resolved further that copies of the resolution be sent to the Honourable Premier, the Chief Secretary of the Uttar Pradesh Government, the Commissioner and the District Magistrate for suitable action;* *Resolved that the District Magistrate and Collector be requested to meet a deputation of the following in this connection at an early date;"* One paragraph of this covering letter contained the following statement:- *"Complaints against these officers had been mounting and a stage was reached when the matter had to be taken up formally. The resolution is not only well-considered and unanimous but represents a consensus of opinion of all practitioners in the Criminal and Revenue side."* This act gave rise to contempt proceedings, based on the claim that the content lowered the authority of the judiciary.		
2.	Bimal Chandra Sen v. Kamla Mathur and Ors. MANU/DE/0025/1982	Injunction order was flouted by the respondents, one of whom was non -party to the injunction order (Illegal construction). The Petitioner/Appellant filed an application for Criminal Contempt under Article 215 of	Party to injunction order : Only a Civil Contempt & not Criminal Contempt, however, since the act amounting to disobedience of injunction order is specifically dealt with in Order 39 Code of Civil	-NA-

		the Constitution of India and Contempt of Courts Act.	Procedure, 1908 application dismissed. Non-party to injunction order: Cannot be punished for Contempt of Court.	
3.	The Registrar General v. Advocate N. Vasudevan 1998 CRILJ 2291	Practicing advocate addressed a letter to the Hon'ble Chief Justice Complaining about two judges and pointing out that one of them comes to Court without preparing himself by scrutinizing the records and as a result, not only it takes a lot of time in the Courtroom but also the Advocates are faced a serious problem in basically projecting the points at issue and another judge was continuously projecting a heavy bias in favour of the landlords in cases arising out of Rent control Act.	Not Convicted.	-NA-
4.	Indirect Tax Practitioners Association v. R.K. Jain MANU/SC/0593/2010	Respondent wrote an editorial in which he commended the administrative and judicial reforms initiated by the new President of Central Excise, Customs and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) and, at the same time, highlighted how some members of CESTAT managed their stay at a particular place. He also made a mention of what he perceived as irregularities in the appointment and posting of Shri T.K. Jayaraman, erstwhile Commissioner of Central Excise, Bangalore as	Hon'ble Supreme Court did not find anything in it which can be described as an attempt to lower the authority of CESTAT or ridicule it in the eyes of the public, rather the object of the editorial was to highlight the irregularities in the appointment, posting and transfer of the members of CESTAT and instances of the abuse of the quasi judicial powers. What was incorporated in the editorial was nothing except the facts relating to manipulative transfer and posting of some	-NA-

		member CESTAT. The respondent then referred to some of the orders passed by the Bench comprising Shri T.K. Jayaraman, which were adversely commented upon by the High Courts of Karnataka and Kerala. He also made a mention of the irregularities in the functioning of the Registry of CESTAT.	members of CESTAT and substance of the orders passed by the particular Bench of CESTAT, which were set aside by the High Courts of Karnataka and Kerala.	
5.	Gyani Chand v. State Of A.P AIR 2016 SC 4403	In this case, the appellant had given an undertaking to the Court in 1985 in a civil suit (O.S. No. 231 of 1972) that he would return certain documents whenever required. These documents originally belonged to his mother, Late Sharda Bai, who was a party in the case. Due to her old age, she authorized the appellant to apply for the return of her documents, which the court allowed upon his undertaking. After receiving the documents, the appellant returned them to his mother, who later confirmed this in a sworn affidavit in 2001, stating the documents were in her possession and not in the appellant's control. Sharda Bai passed away in 2004. Later, when the court asked the appellant to produce the documents (as per his undertaking), he informed the court that the documents were	The Hon'ble Court held the accused not guilty of contempt and acquitted him of all charges. The Hon'ble Court held that to establish civil contempt, there must be a *willful* disobedience of a court's order or undertaking. Since it was *physically impossible* for him to produce the documents, there was no willful default. The Court found it is unfair to direct someone to do the impossible and ruled that failure to comply under such circumstances does not amount to contempt.	The Hon'ble Supreme Court set aside the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh which found the appellant guilty of contempt of court and sentenced him to simple imprisonment for one week and imposed a fine of Rs. 2,000.

		no longer with him. He claimed that: The documents were with his mother until her death. His house had been destroyed by a cyclone in 1999, resulting in the loss of many belongings, possibly including the documents. The core issue was that the appellant had failed to produce the documents as per his legal undertaking, but he argued that he had already returned them to the rightful owner (his mother), and they were later lost or destroyed due to natural calamity and circumstances beyond his control.		
6.	Vishal Tiwari v. Union of India & Ors. (Writ Petition No. 466/2025)	The main contemnor's act alleged in this petition is the public and deliberate scandalizing remarks made by Respondent No. 4, Nishikant Dubey, against the Supreme Court of India and the Chief Justice of India. Respondent No. 4 named the Chief Justice of India as "*responsible for all the civil wars happening in India*" and "*in order to incite religious wars in this country, it is only and only the Supreme Court that is responsible*".	The petition was dismissed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court acknowledged that some statements made by Respondent No. 4 were scandalous and aimed at lowering the authority of the judiciary, particularly statements blaming the CJI and Supreme Court for alleged civil unrest. However, no action was taken, as the Court observed that *"we are of the firm opinion that courts are not as fragile as flowers to wither and wilt under such ludicrous statements. We do not believe that the confidence in and credibility of the courts in the eyes of the public can be shaken by such absurd statements,*	-NA-

			though it can be said without the shadow of doubt that there is a desire and deliberate attempt to do so." Court also observed that Judicial contempt power is discretionary and must be used judiciously. The Court referred to the precedent in *In Re: S. Mulgaokar (1978)* to assert the value of free speech and press, even when critical of the judiciary.	

Annexure 'B'

Acts Constituting Criminal Contempt and Relevant Legal Provisions

S. No.	Act	Relevant Sections	Who can file the complaint
1	Threatening a public servant	224 BNS	Complaint in writing by that court or person authorized by the court
2	Threatening a witness	232 BNS	Witness may file a complaint
3	Intimidating a judge	351 BNS	By the judge himself
4	Misconduct in public by a drunken person.	355 BNS	
5	Damaging court property	324 BNS, 3 & 4 PDPP Act	
6	Obstructing public servant in discharge of public functions	221 BNS	
7	Disobedience to order duly promulgated by public servant	223 BNS	
8	Impersonation in judicial proceedings	242 BNS	
9	Obstructing court officials	124, 126 BNS	
10	Printing or publishing any matter relating to court proceedings without permission	73 BNS	
11	Disclosure of identity of victim of certain offences	72 BNS	
13	Sexual harassment	75 BNS	
14	Word, gesture or act intended to insult modesty of woman	79 BNS	
15	Voluntary causing hurt or grievous hurt to deter public servant from his duty	121 BNS	
16	Assault or criminal force to deter public servant from discharge of his duty	132 BNS	
17	Bribery	170 r/w 173 BNS	
18	Affray	194 BNS	
19	Assaulting or obstructing public servant when suppressing riot etc.	195 BNS	
18	Tampering with evidence	238 BNS	
19	Destruction of document or electronic record to prevent its production as evidence	241 BNS	
20	Intentional insult or interruption to public servant sitting in judicial proceeding	267 BNS	Complaint in writing by that court or person authorized by the court
21	Punishment for public nuisance in cases not otherwise provided for	292 BNS	

Annexure 'C'

Contempt Reference under Section 15(2) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971

To

Ld. Registrar General,
Hon'ble High Court of Delhi,
New Delhi – 110003

Subject: Reference under Section 15(2) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for initiating contempt proceedings against Advocate, Mr. X.

Respected Sir,

1. Incident Description

The undersigned is constrained to make this reference under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and the Contempt of Courts (Delhi High Court) Rules, 2025 in respect of an incident that occurred before the undersigned on 01.06.2025 during the course of judicial proceedings while the undersigned presided the court of Judicial Magistrate First Class-1, Dwarka Courts, New Delhi. The following incident occurred during the hearing of a bail application in FIR no. 123/2025 in case titled State v. [Accused Name].

[Narration of the incident]

2. Legal Basis for Reference

The conduct of Mr. X amounts to criminal contempt within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, as it:
- Scandalised and tended to scandalise the authority of this Court;
- Lowered the dignity and public image of the Court in the eyes of the attendees;
- Obstructed the administration of justice by attempting to intimidate the Court post-delivery of a judicial order.

The language and conduct of the advocate, apart from being wholly unbecoming of an officer of the court, strikes at the very root of the administration of justice. If left unchecked, such behaviour sets a dangerous precedent and weakens the majesty of the court. Despite the opportunity to apologise and withdraw his remarks, no remorse was shown.

Accordingly, the undersigned deems it appropriate that the matter be referred to the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi for cognizance and appropriate action.

4. Compliance with Rules

This reference is being made in accordance with Rule 5(2)(c) and Rule 8 of the Contempt of Courts (Delhi High Court) Rules, 2025. The following documents are enclosed:

- Certified copy of the relevant judicial order sheet;
- Typed transcript of the contemptuous remarks;
- Statements of the Court Reader and Court Ahlmad who witnessed the incident;
- Incident report duly signed and sealed;
- CCTV footage preservation request (if applicable).

5. Prayer

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that this reference may kindly be placed before the Hon'ble High Court for initiating criminal contempt proceedings against Mr. X, in accordance with law.

Submitted respectfully,

Sd/-

[Name of Judicial Officer]
[Designation]
[District & Court Name]
[Date]