



\$~11

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 5/2025**

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTIONPetitioner

Through: Mr.Harsh Prabhakar, Advocate.
(*Amicus Curiae*) with
Mr.Dhruv Chaudhry, Mr.
Shubham & Mr.Vijit Singh,
Advocates.

versus

SANJUCTA KABASI, ADVOCATERespondent

Through: Mr. Aman Usman, APP with
Mr. Manvendra Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Kumar Singh,
Ms. Simran Jain, Ms. Vedanshi
Jalan, Advs. for LinkedIn
Corporation.
Respondent in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **27.03.2026**

1. The present Contempt Case has been registered on a reference dated 26.03.2025 received from the Court of the learned JMFC-06(C)/THC/Delhi through the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge (HQs) addressed to the learned Registrar General of this Court, the relevant portion of which is reproduced as under:

"xxxxxx

That one Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi is party in cross FIR No. 188 PS Civil Lines and 189/2019, PS Civil Lines which are pending before the court of the undersigned. That in case FIR No. 188/2019 PS Civil Lines, Ms. Sanjucta



Kabasi is the complainant and the matter is pending at the stage of her examination. On 21.01.2025, her examination in chief was concluded and her cross examination was deferred at her request. Vide order dated 21.01.2025, the matter was fixed for 25.01.2025 at 2:0PM for her cross examination and she was bound down for next date of hearing. On 25.01.2025 at PM, when the matter was taken up on the first call, the complainant did not appear before the court for her cross examination. Ld. Counsel for accused alleged that the complainant is deliberately not appearing for her cross and repeated adjournments have been taken by her on one pretext or another and requested the court that NBWs be issued against her. The court declined the request of Ld. Counsel for accused and instead BWs were issued against her.

At around 3.35 PM, the complainant appeared before the court and the matter was taken up at her oral request and she was apprised about the proceedings of the court, however, the complainant started raising her voice and even used unparliamentary language against the undersigned and further leveled scandalous allegations by saying that the court is working in collusion with the accused persons. Despite repeated warnings by the undersigned to the complainant to not to use unparliamentary language and to maintain the decorum of the court, the complainant refused to mend her ways. To control the situation, the matter was adjourned on date already fixed i.e. 25.02.2025 at 2:00 PM and the BWs issued against her were cancelled since the complainant had appeared before the court.

The court of the undersigned had vide its order dated 25.01.2025 in case FIR No. 188/2019 PS Civil Lines had clearly apprised the complainant Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi of her right to approach Ld. CJM , Central, THC, Delhi for transferring her matters to some other court if she has lost faith in the court of undersigned.

Few days later, Ld. LAC Sh. Rahul Tandon deputed in the court of the undersigned apprised the court that the complainant Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi had posted on LinkedIn (a social media platform) wherein she has leveled serious and scandalous allegations of bias and collusion against the undersigned. Further, she has also uploaded the digitally signed order-sheets of order dated 25.01.2025 on her said social media post.

When the undersigned came to know about her



social media post, an intimation was sent regarding the conduct of Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi to Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge, Central, vide letter dated 12.02.2025 and it was requested that necessary steps be taken against her.

On 10.02.2025, when the cross case FIR No. 189/2019 PS Civil Lines was taken up where Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi is an accused, fresh vakalatnama was filed on behalf of the accused persons which was taken on record. Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of accused persons had supplied order dated 04.02.2025 of Ld. Principal District and Sessions Judge (Hqs), Tis Hazari Court, Delhi was to served upon the other party. The matter was adjourned at the request of Ld. Counsel for the accused.

On 17.02.2025, an application was received in the court of the undersigned, where the accused/Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi had leveled serious allegations of bias and collusion against her and had requested the court of the undersigned to modify its order dated 10.02.2025 in case FIR No. 189/2019 PS Civil Lines as attendance of the other party i.e. complainant was marked behind her back. In her application dated 17.02.2025, she has further stated that a vigilance inquiry is already pending in Hon'ble High Court of Delhi against the undersigned.

The undersigned had issued show cause notice dated 04.03.2025 to Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi to show cause as to why reference should not be made to Hon'ble High Court of Delhi under Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Reply to the show cause notice was filed by Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi but she failed to disclose any fact as to why reference shall not be made against her.

Instead of following with due process of law, the complainant choose to level baseless allegations against the undersigned on social media post on LinkedIn and also made scandalous and contemptuous remarks against the undersigned. She instead of following the due process, has choose to vitiate the proceedings pending before the court and has intendd to lower the authority of the court.

Therefore, your high office is kindly requested to initiate proceedings under Contempt of Courts Act. 1971 against Sanjucta Kabasi.

xxxxxx"

2. The reference also includes the complained of post on LinkedIn,



which is as under:

19/02/2025, 16:01

Sanjucta Kabasi on LinkedIn: warrant order | 35 comments

19



Join now

Sign in



Articles



People



Learning



Jobs



Games

Sanjucta Kabasi's Post



Sanjucta Kabasi

Law Practitioner | Junior Research Fellow '24

3w · Edited

Practice Knowledge #49: How to deal with biased judicial officers?

"oyye mere se aise baat mat kar". When I replied, "Is this how a judicial officer should behave?" he replied, "main aise hi bolta hoon, jaha complaint daalna hain daal". This is a shameful incident which I experienced as a complainant and witness in the Court no. 247 presided by one Gaurav Goyal, JMFC-06(Central) at Tis Hazari Courts wherein my legitimate absence before Principal District & Sessions Court became the main reason for him to issue warrants against me. The said order was later recalled by him after realising that his position could be at risk if his conduct is taken into cognizance by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Mr. Goyal, a young and immature judicial officer of less than 1.5 years in service like every other newly appointed judicial officer arrogant of his power and privilege. He has taken for granted the term "your lordship" and enjoys showing tantrums to even senior advocates. Framing of charges in routine manner, signing arrest warrants, neglecting compliance of superior courts, frequent issuing of summons, favouring cases of his known persons, using humiliating and filthy words are some of his greatest traits. He and other such have taken their attitude for granted because advocates do not protest.

This judicial officer has been pressurizing me for a long time to complete my evidence because he has made a deal with the counsel of the other side that he will finish the trial as soon as possible with the promise to acquit the accused persons. Both this officer and the counsel had several meetings behind my back which I came to know through a court staff. As soon as I came to know I filed a transfer petition before the Hon'ble District Judge. As both these matters clashed at the same time on the same day, this officer took out his grudge against me by issuing warrants with surety on the behest of the counsel of the accused persons.

When I appeared thereafter he threatened me saying he has signed the warrants and he will not cancel it. I immediately rushed to the office of the District Judge and after getting strong reprimand he had to recall his order which is shown recorded at 3:35pm with many of the submissions self-generated.

The reason to share this order is to spread awareness against the growing ill-mannered behaviour of young judicial officers. One must know that how advocates are harassed by these errant officers because they never protest and ultimately lose their case in trial. Issuance of warrants against the advocates is against judicial impropriety. I condemn the actions of the judge and have also lodged complaint to the Registrar General seeking for stricter actions.

Please like and share for the sake of advocates

https://www.linkedin.com/pusts/sanjuctakabasi_warrant-order-activity-7289499094199287808-EZjy?utm_source=social_share... 1.

3. Notice of this petition was issued to the respondent *vide* order dated 01.05.2025. The respondent has filed her reply to the same, wherein she has made allegations of the improper conduct of the

This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 30/03/2026 at 21:26:31



concerned Judicial Officer, including suggesting that he was doing so at the behest of the other party in the cross-FIR. Interestingly, she alleges almost verbal oral remarks which are also mentioned in the subject LinkedIn post attributed to the concerned Judicial Officer. However, she has denied the said LinkedIn post being uploaded by her.

4. On account of the said denial, this Court on 29.01.2026, passed the following order and directions:

“1. One of the grounds on which the present reference is based is an alleged LinkedIn post, titling ‘Sanjuncta Kabasi’s Post’, appearing at pages 19 and 20 of the PDF paper book.

*2. **Question:** We have enquired from the respondent if the said LinkedIn account on which the post appearing at pages 19 and 20 of the PDF paper book was uploaded, belongs to her?*

*3. **Answer:** The respondent answers by saying that the said account does not belong to her.*

4. As this may have a vital bearing on answering the contempt reference, we would request LinkedIn Corporation to disclose the identity and details of the person who has created this account and uploaded the above referred post.

5. We further request the Cyber Cell of the Delhi Police to furnish a report specifying (i) the date on which the post appearing at pages 19 and 20 of the PDF paper book was created, (ii) the IP address from which it was posted, (iii) if the post has been removed, the date of removal and the IP address from which such removal was effected, and (iv) the date of creation of the concerned LinkedIn account as depicted at pages 19 and 20 of the PDF paper book, along with the IP address associated therewith.

6. The reports be filed before us within a period of two weeks of receipt of this order.

7. A copy of this order be sent to LinkedIn Corporation through its nominated counsel (sjkumar@luthra.com, abhishekks@luthra.com and



saurabhk@luthra.com) and through the APP to the DCP, Cyber Cell, for ensuring compliance.

8. A copy of this order should also accompany the subject post which is appearing at pages 19 and 20 of the PDF paper book.

9. The Registry is also directed to paginate the file and supply the same to the learned Amicus Curiae and also to the respondent so that they are able to make their submissions before us.

10. List on 11th March, 2026.”

5. In response and in compliance with the said order, a Compliance Affidavit dated 23.02.2026 has been filed by LinkedIn Corporation, which *inter-alia* states as under:

“4. The information available with LinkedIn Corporation with respect to the identity and details of the person who created the account, as directed in para 4 of the Order, is as follows:

a) **Name:** Sanjuncta Kabasi

b) **Email:** skabasi45@gmail.com

c) **Location:** New Delhi, Delhi, India - 110001

d) **Date of creation of the LinkedIn account:**
14.10.2023

e) **IP address (Account Creation):**
2402:3a80:995:9b76:792c:dc9a:c40:9983”

6. The learned APP also handed over a Status Report dated 02.03.2026, which *inter alia* states as under:

“However, LinkedIn did provide the Email Id, date and time of creation of the concerned account. Additionally, LinkedIn furnished IP logs of the account, though without port numbers.

During further course of enquiry, the IP logs provided by LinkedIn were checked and forwarded to the Internet Service Providers, namely VI (Vodafone Idea), Jio, and Airtel, with a request to identify the subscribers connected with the IP addresses at the relevant dates and times. The ISPs have since furnished their replies.

As per the details received from VI (Vodafone Idea), IP logs provided by the LinkedIn were allotted to Mobile number 7838558407, which was found registered on the



name of Ms. Sanjucta D/o Manoranjan Kabasi. (Annexure-E)

As per the details received from JIO, IP logs provided by the LinkedIn were allotted to mobile number 8700608356, which was found registered on the name of Ms Sanjucta D/o Manoranjan Kabasi. (Annexure-F)

*Additionally, as per the information provided by the ISPs, it has been found that on 7 October 2024, one of the IP addresses was allotted to a mobile number 9958698851. The mobile is found registered in the name of **Shubhankar Kabasi S/o Manoranjan Kabasi**, brother of the respondent. It is possible that the respondent may have accessed her LinkedIn account by connecting her device to her brother's mobile data through a hotspot facility. It is also possible that she may have directly attempted to log in to her LinkedIn account using her brother's mobile device. In both scenarios, the activity is attributable to the respondent herself, as the account credentials used for login were hers. (Annexure-G)*

From the replies of service providers it has been confirmed that the IP addresses reflected in LinkedIn's logs were connected with mobile numbers registered in the name of Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi and Shubhankar Kabasi. A detailed table of IP logs with date and time provided by LinkedIn and subscribers connected with those IP addresses at that relevant dates and times is attached. (Annexure-H).

These confirmations establish a direct link between the LinkedIn account activity and the respondent's mobile connections.

On the basis of the information received, it is respectfully submitted that while LinkedIn Corporation was unable to provide post-specific IP data, the account creation logs and IP history supplied by them were sufficient for the ISPs to trace the activity. The ISP replies conclusively demonstrate that the LinkedIn account in question was accessed and operated through mobile numbers belonging to Ms. Sanjucta Kabasi.”

7. The learned counsel appearing for LinkedIn also informs this court by way of a Note on Submissions, that the subject LinkedIn account was closed/deleted on 29.01.2026 at about 2:18:40 PM IST,



that is, curiously the same day as the passing of the above mentioned order by this Court. He further explains the process by which LinkedIn traced the relevant account through the URL which was appearing on the subject post.

8. The respondent who appears in person still maintains that the said post was not uploaded by her.

9. *Prima facie* we find enough material against her to show that the said account not only belongs to her but also was being operated by her from the IP addresses belonging to her and her brother. The post by itself contains scandalous remarks made against the concerned Judicial Officer.

10. We have enquired from her if she would like to justify the allegations contained therein. However, she maintains that as the post is not uploaded by her, the question of justifying the same does not arise.

11. As noted herein above, the contempt reference is also on the basis of the proceedings that took place before the Court of learned Judicial Officer on 25.01.2025 wherein it has been alleged that the respondent not only raised her voice but even used unparliamentary language against the judicial officer and leveled scandalous allegations by saying that the court is working in collusion with the accused persons.

12. From the reply filed by the respondent to the present contempt petition, the respondent in a manner is reiterating the allegation of the learned Judicial Officer working in collusion with the opposing party. We have again inquired from her if she has any material or



justification from making such allegations. She submits that the Court record is a justification for the same.

13. As *prima facie* we find that the above allegations are intended to scandalize the Court and have the effect of lowering the authority of the Court and to interfere with the due course of the judicial proceedings and the administration of justice, accordingly, we frame the following charge against the respondent:

- a. That on 25.01.2025 during the course of hearing of FIR No. 188/2019 & FIR No, 189/2019, PS-Civil Lines, wherein you are a party in person, you had raised your voice and even used un-parliamentary language in open court against the court and further leveled scandalous allegations by saying that the court is working in collusion with the accused persons. You kept using the un-parliamentary language and refused to maintain the decorum of the court despite repeated warnings. By the above act you have lowered the authority of the Court and tried to interfere with the due course of the judicial proceedings and the administration of justice, thereby committing criminal contempt as defined in Section 2 (c) of the Contempt of Court Act, 1971, and punishable under Section 12 of the said Act.
- b. You have uploaded the LinkedIn post which has been reproduced hereinabove and reference of which is available at page no. 19 of the paperbook, thereby scandalizing the Court and interfering with the due course of judicial proceedings and the administration of the justice, thereby committing criminal contempt as defined in Section 2 (c) of the Contempt of Court



Act, 1971, and punishable under Section 12 of the said Act.

14. The respondent pleads not guilty to the above charges.
15. The respondent shall file an affidavit in terms of Rule 12 of the Contempt of Courts (Delhi High Court Rules, 2025) by way of reply to the charges, supplying a copy thereof to the learned *amicus*, within a period of 04 weeks.
16. The respondent shall remain personally present in Court on the next date of hearing.
17. The learned counsel for the LinkedIn Corporation as well as the Investigating Officer are discharged from appearing in this case, unless otherwise directed in the future.
18. A copy of this order be supplied to the respondent.
19. List on 26th May, 2026.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

MARCH 27, 2026/gs/na/ik