



2026:DHC:6684



\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Judgment Reserved on: 15.05.2026

Judgment delivered on: 14.08.2026

Judgment uploaded on: 15.08.2026

#

CNR No: DLHC010689522024

+

W.P.(CRL) 3144/2024, CRL.M.A. 30444/2024, CRL.M.A. 34529/2024, CRL.M.A. 34572/2024, CRL.M.A. 10414/2025, CRL.M.A. 13173-13174/2025, CRL.M.A. 23305/2025

HARJEET SINGH MENDIRATTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mrs. Kajal Chandra, Mr. Dalip Singh,
Ms. Hatneimawi and Mr. Suyash
Swarup, Advs. for the Petitioner and
Ms. Kalpana

versus

**STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI
AND ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Tanishq
Srivastava, Mr. Abhijit Chakravarty
and Ms. A. Hussain, Advs. for BCDMr. Pawanjit Singh Bindra, Sr. Adv.
with Mr. Ashish Garg and Mr.
Ashmeet Singh, Advs. for R-2 along
with R- 2 in personMr. Preet Pal Singh, Adv. for BCI
(through vc)Ms. Chand Chopra, Amicus Curiae
with Mr. Punishk Handa, Adv.Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyia, ASC
(Crl.) with Mr. Abhijeet Kumar, Adv.
for R-3 and R-4 with SI Rahul, P.S.
Malviya Nagar



%

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

J U D G M E N T

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J:

1. The present proceedings arise out of W.P. (CRL.) No. 3144/2024, instituted by the petitioner [i.e. Harjeet Singh Mendiratta] under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking quashing of Complaint Case No. 463048/2016 [earlier number C.C. 1440/2007], titled '*Sonia Mendiratta v. Harjeet Singh Mendiratta*' ['criminal complaint'], which was pending before the Court of the learned Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, New Delhi, ['ACMM'] as well as the consequential criminal proceedings arising therefrom.

1.1. This Court, *vide* order dated 06.03.2025, issued a show cause notice to the filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana on learning that the petitioner had deliberately suppressed the material fact of having filed an earlier petition i.e., CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012 before this Court seeking the identical relief of quashing of the said criminal complaint. The said petition had been dismissed *vide* order dated 18.12.2012. However, in the present petition there was no disclosure of the earlier petition and its dismissal. To the contrary there was a positive assertion in the mandatory disclosure paragraph (i.e., number 46) that petitioner had not filed any similar petition seeking quashing of the criminal complaint before this Court. The filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana is the wife of the petitioner and had personal knowledge of the earlier petition and its dismissal. In the *prima facie* opinion



of the Court, the suppression of the earlier petition was deliberate and intended to interfere with the administration of justice. It also amounted to professional misconduct by the filing advocate, who has a duty to verify the correctness of the pleadings. The Court, accordingly, on 06.03.2025 called upon the filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana to explain why proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 [‘Act of 1971’] and disciplinary proceedings before the Bar Council of Delhi ought not to be initiated against her.

1.2. This Court was also apprised that suppression in the present petition was not an isolated fact and there was documented history in Court orders from 2018 to 2025 of persistent abuse of process by the petitioner and the filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana, in the petitioner’s defense of the criminal complaint. The record shows filing of multiple non-maintainable challenges to the orders passed in the criminal complaint, multiple petitions seeking transfer of the presiding officer, which were dismissed for lacking merit by the petitioner aided by the filing advocate Kalpana, leading to passing of strictures against the petitioner.

1.3. Pending consideration of the aforesaid show cause notice dated 06.03.2025, this Court has been informed that the Complaint Case No. 463048/2016 has since been decided by the Ld. JMFC-02, South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi, *vide* judgment dated 12.02.2026, who has dismissed the complaint case by holding that respondent no. 2 (i.e., Sonia Mendiratta) has failed to prove the case beyond reasonable doubt.

1.4. However, looking at the deliberate misconduct of the filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana and the petitioner, this Court deemed it appropriate to hear Ms.



2026:DHC:6684



Kalpana in her reply to the show cause dated 06.03.2025 and also deal with the writ petition.

1.5. The present judgment therefore deals with the issue that whether filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana, who represented the petitioner in the subject writ proceedings, who is also his spouse and Special Power of Attorney [‘SPA’] holder, has rendered herself liable to proceedings under the Act of 1971, for wilful suppression, interference with the administration of justice and whether a reference ought to be made to the Bar Council of Delhi [‘BCD’] for initiating disciplinary proceedings into the misconduct of the said advocate.

1.6. This judgment also deals with the dismissal of the writ petition for the wilful suppression.

I. FACTS AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS LEADING TO THE INITIATION OF CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS

2. The dispute between the parties emanates from a long-standing family dispute relating to property bearing G-23, Triveni Commercial Complex, Sheikh Sarai, Phase-I, New Delhi [‘property’]. Following the death of the petitioner’s mother, Late Smt. Trilochan Kaur on 14.11.2005 disputes arose between the petitioner and respondent no. 2, petitioner’s sister, concerning the ownership of the said property. The petitioner alleged that respondent no. 2, in collusion with other family members, had executed fraudulent relinquishment deeds and sought mutation of the property in her favour. These disputes gave rise to multiple civil and criminal proceedings before different judicial forums.



2.1. On 23.05.2007, respondent no. 2 instituted proceedings under Section 156(3) Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ['CrPC'] before the learned ACMM, New Delhi, which came to be registered as the subject criminal complaint, alleging commission of offences under Sections 323, 341, 451, 506 and 509 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ['IPC'], in view of the complaints dated 06.09.2006 and 21.03.2007. By order dated 05.06.2007, the learned ACMM treated the application as a complaint under Section 200 of the CrPC, and by a subsequent order dated 08.06.2007, summoned the petitioner.

2.2. On 01.10.2012, the petitioner instituted CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012, titled '*Harjeet Singh Mendiratta v. State & Ors*'. before the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court seeking quashing of the aforesaid complaint case [C.C. 1440/2007] and the summoning order dated 08.06.2007. By judgment dated 18.12.2012, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court dismissed the quashing petition on the grounds of delay and laches.

The relief sought in CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012, is identical with the subject writ petition and the wilful suppression of this petition and its dismissal has resulted in initiation of these contempt proceedings.

2.3. Reverting to the proceedings in the criminal complaint, learned ACMM dismissed the petitioner's application seeking discharge *vide* order dated 14.03.2018.

Thereafter, charges were framed on 03.04.2018.

2.4. The petitioner filed Revision Petition No. 102/2018 before Special Judge, NDPS South District, Saket impugning the order dated 03.04.2018.



This revision petition was dismissed *vide* order dated 01.05.2018.

Thus, the order framing charge had attained finality. Needless to state that the order dated 14.03.2018 dismissing the application seeking discharge had merged with the order directing framing of charges on 03.04.2018.

2.5. The petitioner, without any legal basis, instituted another revision, being Criminal Revision No. 165/2018, before the learned Special Judge (PC Act), CBI-01, Saket Courts, New Delhi [‘Special Judge’], challenging the initial order dated 14.03.2018. The petitioner, however, wilfully suppressed the filing of earlier Revision Petition No. 102/2018 and the dismissal order dated 01.05.2018, which led to upholding the order dated 03.04.2018.

By order dated 10.07.2018, the learned Special Judge dismissed Criminal Revision No. 165/2018 with costs of Rs. 20,000/- after recording that the petitioner had failed to disclose dismissal of the earlier revision petition 102/2018. Although the Court noticed the suppression, it refrained from initiating contempt proceedings and adopted a lenient approach, at the request of the petitioner. The relevant paragraphs of the order dated 10.07.2018 read as under: -

“5..... The factum of the said order on charge having already been challenged by filing of the revision petition and dismissal of the said revision petition, having not been disclosed in the revision petition filed before this court, **per-se amounts to contempt**, besides the fact that filing of another revision petition against the same order is not maintainable and challenge to framing of charge in isolation is not permissible.

6. Though this court finds the submission obnoxious that merely the framing of charge has been challenged without challenging the order on charge in the instant revision petition, while it is noted that the petition challenging the order on charge has already been dismissed,



however, this court is not inclined to proceed further with the contempt application accepting the plea of counsel for petitioner to take lenient view, but in these circumstances, revision petition stands dismissed with cost of Rs. 20,000/-, half of which shall be deposited in the Legal Aid.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

2.6. Thereafter, learned ACMM *vide* order dated 19.12.2022 dismissed the petitioner’s application seeking dropping of proceedings concerning the complaint dated 06.09.2006 and clubbing the two incidents dated 03.09.2006 and 17.03.2007 under Section 219 of Cr.P.C.

The petitioner instituted yet another revision challenging the aforesaid order dated 19.12.2022. The said revision being Criminal Revision No. 95/2023 was pursued by Ms. Kalpana being a counsel for the revisionist/petitioner. The Revision Petition was dismissed on 18.03.2023 by the learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, South District, Saket Courts, who recorded that the petitioner had, in all, filed seven (7) revision petitions in the *same* complaint case and held the proceedings to be an *abuse of the process of law*. The relevant paragraph of the order dated 18.03.2023 reads as under: -

“7 As noticed above, petitioner has already filed about **7 revision petitions** before Sessions court. Challenge to framing of charge has already failed previously. Seeking the same relief by moving an application for dropping of proceedings and carrying it further to the revisional court is an absolute misuse of the process of law; especially when the petitioner has stated in the revision petition itself that this argument was also raised at the stage of challenge to framing of charge.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

2.7. Thereafter, the petitioner, undeterred, instituted a transfer petition before the learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, South District, Saket



Courts, seeking transfer of the complaint case [‘C.C. 1440/2007’] from the Court of the learned ACMM. The transfer petition was dismissed by the learned District Judge *vide* order dated 27.07.2024.

The petitioner challenged the aforesaid order dated 27.07.2024 before the High Court in Cr. M.C. 6487/2024 along with the filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana. The High Court by its order dated 21.08.2024 dismissed the petition and observed that the prayer seeking transfer was intended to exercise *undue pressure* on the Judge hearing the criminal complaint. The relevant paras of the order dated 21.08.2024 read as under: -

“8. A perusal of the abovementioned table shows that the Petitioner has filed transfer petitions seeking transfer of cases from the Court of five different judges. It cannot be said that every judge, against whom transfer petitions were filed by the Petitioner, is biased against the Petitioner.

.....

16. Mere perception of suspicion or apprehension of bias is not sufficient to entertain a plea of transfer. A perusal of the grounds raised by the Petitioner for transfer of the case or in the present Petition, does not show that the Judge overseeing the proceedings was biased in any manner against the Petitioner. This Court is of the opinion that the present Petition is only a method to put pressure on the Judge hearing the case of the Petitioner. This Court cannot ignore the fact that Order transferring a case from one Court to another or from one Judge to another casts an aspersion on the Judge and on his/her reputation. Withdrawing cases from a Judge on mere allegations of biasness without there being a reasonable belief will be prejudicial to the independence of judiciary. Learned Principal District and Sessions Judge is the best person to take a decision as to whether the case should be transferred or not and after looking into the facts and circumstances of the present case, the conduct of the Petitioner, the allegations made by the Petitioner and the Order sheets of the Magistrate Court, the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge has come to the conclusion that the Magistrate is not acting in a biased manner and the apprehension of biasness claimed by the Petitioner is



completely unwarranted.

17. In view of the above, this Court, while sitting in revisionary jurisdiction, is not inclined to interfere with the decision taken by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge as nothing has been brought out in the present Petition which would persuade this Court to interfere with the Order passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, which is a well-reasoned Order.

18. Accordingly, the Petition is dismissed, along with the pending applications, if any.”

[Emphasis supplied]

2.8. In the aforementioned background, of judicial orders recording scathing remarks against the petitioner as regards his conduct of obstructing the legal process, on 26.09.2024, notwithstanding the dismissal of the earlier quashing petition CRL. M.C. No. 3870/2012 on 18.12.2012, the petitioner instituted the present W.P. (CRL.) No. 3144/2024, once again seeking quashing of the *same* criminal complaint and proceedings arising therefrom, pending before the learned ACMM, New Delhi.

2.9. The writ petition was drafted and filed by Ms. Kalpana, Advocate, who had represented the petitioner in the defense of the criminal complaint proceedings. She is his spouse as well as his SPA holder. Ms. Kalpana was therefore completely aware about the history of the criminal complaint proceedings. However, there was wilful suppression of CRL. M.C. No. 3870/2012 and the order of dismissal dated 18.12.2012. The prayers sought in the present writ petition are as under: -

a) Call/ summon the trial Court record of case bearing CT Case/463048/2016 titled as "Sonia Mendiratta Vs. Harjeet Singh Mendiratta" from the court of Ms. Shilpi Singh, JMFC-02, South, Saket Court, for examination in relation to the ongoing proceedings.



b) Quash the criminal proceedings from Ct. Case 463048/2016 titled as "Sonia Mendiratta Vs. Harjeet Singh Mendiratta" arising from the complaints dated 06.09.2006 & 21.03.2007, pending before the court of Ms. Shilpi Singh, Ld. JMFC-02, South, Saket Court. As the said complaints have already been destroyed and never examined in court, should not form the basis of further prosecution against the Petitioner.

c) Any other relief(s)/order(s)/direction(s) in favour of petitioner as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

[Emphasis supplied]

2.10. Respondent no. 2 entered appearance in these proceedings on 20.10.2024 and filed its reply. Respondent no. 2 took an objection as regards suppression of the filing of earlier CRL. M.C. No. 3870/2012, the order of dismissal dated 18.12.2012 as well as order dated 10.07.2018 passed by learned Special Judge dismissing the revision petition. Respondent no. 2 also filed CRL. M.A. 34529/2024, on 16.11.2024, against the petitioner for the act of perjury. Respondent also filed its reply to the petition on 16.11.2024.

2.11. Petitioner on 16.11.2024, e-filed additional documents *vide* diary no. 5277059 and included orders dated 08.12.2012 and 10.07.2018. The proof of service of the documents on the respondent no. 2 is of 16.11.2024, however, inexplicably the index bears the date of 12.11.2024. In the considered opinion of the Court the date of 12.11.2024 on the index has been put mischievously to antedate the filing.

2.12. The petitioner was undeterred by the submissions of the respondent no. 2 evidencing the wilful suppression by the petitioner of the earlier petition. Petitioner instead of conceding to the suppression, continued to prosecute the present writ petition. In fact, petitioner filed a counter-blast



perjury application being no. Crl. M.A. No. 34579/2024 seeking initiation of perjury proceedings against respondent no. 2 and her counsel.

This action of the petitioner and its filing counsel Ms. Kalpana, who is the wife of the petitioner, evidences the wilful suppression, lack of contrition and *bullying* of the respondent no. 2.

2.13. During the hearing held on 06.03.2025, learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2 reiterated that paragraph 46 of the writ petition contained a false declaration that no earlier proceedings seeking the same relief had been filed. Paragraph 46 reads as under: -

“46. That the Petitioner has not filed any other similar petition seeking quashing of criminal proceedings arises from the complaints in question either before this Hon'ble Court or before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

It was brought to the notice of the Court that the petitioner had earlier instituted CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012 before this Court seeking identical reliefs, which had been dismissed on 18.12.2012. It was submitted that the non-disclosure of the earlier quashing petition and its dismissal constituted a deliberate suppression of material facts.

2.14. It was contended that the false declaration contained in paragraph 46 of the underlying petition had been made despite filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana possessing complete personal knowledge of the earlier litigation as she is not only the petitioner's counsel but is also his spouse and SPA holder. It was stated that she had been representing the petitioner in the complaint proceedings and was personally aware about the history.



2.15. It was further brought to the notice of the Court that adverse observations regarding the conduct of filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana had already been recorded by the learned Special Judge in orders dated 28.05.2018 and 10.07.2018 passed in Crl. Rev. Petition No. 165/2018. The relevant portion of the order dated 28.05.2018 reads as under:

“Present: Counsel Sh. Satya Prakash Yadav and Ms. Kalpna for petitioner.
Counsel Sh. J. P. Singh for respondent.

Fresh vakalatnama filed on behalf of respondent.

Counsel for respondent was present at first call when the reply and contempt application were filed on record. It was submitted that the petitioner has approached this court against the framing of charge whereas order on charge had already been challenged by the petitioner and revision petition had already been dismissed **which fact has not been mentioned in the present revision petition.** Ld. Counsel for petitioner, who has appeared now, seeks time to address the arguments on the point of maintainability of present revision petition as well respond to the contempt application filed by the respondent. Counsel for respondent, as stated, has suddenly fallen ill, therefore, is not present now. Copy of paper book filed by the respondent be placed on record during the course of the day to be collected by the petitioner.

Be put up on 10.7.2018.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

2.16. As already noted above, ultimately on 10.07.2018 the learned Special Judge dismissed the aforesaid writ petition with costs Rs 20,000/-, with the observation that petitioner appearing through the advocate, Ms. Kalpana was guilty of suppressing relevant earlier proceedings.

3. This Court, by order dated 06.03.2025, recorded a prima facie opinion that the subject writ petition had been drafted by the filing advocate, Ms.



Kalpana after deliberately withholding material facts from the Court. Consequently, this Court issued a show cause notice to Ms. Kalpana requiring her to explain why proceedings should not be initiated against her under the Act of 1971, issued notice to the BCD and the President of the Delhi High Court Bar Association, appointed Ms. Chand Chopra, Advocate, as Amicus Curiae to assist the Court regarding the nature of proceedings liable to be initiated against Ms. Kalpana, and also called upon Ms. Kalpana to file her response to the show cause notice. The relevant portion of the order dated 06.03.2025 read as under: -

“4. He states that the present quashing petition has been filed by the same Advocate Ms. Kalpana. He states that at paragraph 46 of the petition, the Petitioner, along with the counsel, Ms. Kalpana, who personally possesses knowledge of the litigation, has made a false declaration qua non-filing of prior proceedings on the same cause of action and for the same relief. He states that for the identical reliefs sought herein, the Petitioner, represented by the same counsel Ms. Kalpana, had previously filed CRL.MC 3870/2012, titled S. Harjeet Singh Mendiratta v. State and Others, before this Hon'ble Court, which was ultimately dismissed by an order dated 18.12.2012. He states that non-disclosure of the said previous proceedings and the order on dismissal on merits is a fraudulent conduct by the Advocate and the Petitioner.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

4. Pursuant thereto, Ms. Kalpana filed a reply dated 15.04.2025. When the matter was taken up on 30.04.2025, this Court noticed that the reply had not been supported by an affidavit and directed that an affidavit be filed. Also, the report submitted by the learned Amicus Curiae dated 03.04.2025 was simultaneously taken on record, and the matter was thereafter heard extensively on the issue of contempt.



4.1. In her report, the learned Amicus Curiae concluded that Ms. Kalpana had appeared throughout the litigation in a dual capacity, namely as the petitioner's advocate and his SPA holder, while also being his spouse. Consequently, she possessed direct and personal knowledge of the dismissal of CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012. The Amicus opined that the declaration made in paragraph 46 of the underlying writ petition was demonstrably false, that no satisfactory explanation had been furnished for the suppression, and that the conduct disclosed on record warranted consideration not only under the Act of 1971, but also under the disciplinary jurisdiction of the BCD under the Advocates Act and the Bar Council of India Rules.

4.2. The learned Amicus Curiae submitted that in the reply filed by Ms. Kalpana there was no explanation whatsoever for suppression of the earlier quashing proceedings despite Ms. Kalpana's undisputed personal knowledge thereof. She submitted that there was no apology tendered by Ms. Kalpana in her reply.

4.3. The learned Amicus Curiae, therefore, suggested that should this Court find the explanation tendered by Ms. Kalpana to be unsatisfactory, it may consider the statutory remedies available in law, including proceedings contemplated under the Act of 1971, reference to the BCD under Section 35 of the Advocates Act, 1961, prosecution under Section 217 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and the imposition of exemplary costs. These recommendations are founded upon the statutory framework and judicial precedents discussed in the report.

5. During the subsequent hearings, respondent no. 2 also placed before



2026:DHC:6684



this Court, details of numerous proceedings instituted by the petitioner and Ms. Kalpana against advocates representing respondent no. 2, Judicial Officers, and witnesses connected with the litigation. By order dated 06.12.2025, this Court recorded that the material placed before it disclosed a discernible pattern of filing proceedings intentionally against advocates and other participants in the judicial process, apparently with a view to discourage them from discharging their professional duties.

6. By a detailed order dated 20.12.2025, this Court further recorded that the petitioner had admittedly failed to disclose the earlier quashing petition. The Court also took note of observations made by a Co-ordinate Bench in CRL.M.C. 6487/2024, filed by the petitioner, that the petitioner had repeatedly filed transfer petitions against different judicial officers, which appeared to be an attempt to exert pressure upon the judiciary. Upon considering the cumulative record, this Court observed that the conduct of the petitioner and Ms. Kalpana disclosed a glaring pattern of resorting to unfair practices in judicial proceedings. Pending consideration of the show cause notice, Ms. Kalpana was cautioned against acting or filing pleadings on behalf of the petitioner as his Advocate, after observing that her personal interest in the litigation had resulted in interference with the administration of justice and fomenting of litigation. The relevant paragraphs of the order dated 20.12.2025 reads as under: -

“.....

12. Learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that the order dated 18.12.2012 passed in CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012 was not disclosed in the petition. She states that this was an error and seeks to tenders an apology on behalf of the petitioner.



13. This Court will on the next date of hearing will examine the issue of making a reference to Bar Council of Delhi as well as the issue of nature of contempt.

14. This Court however takes note of the observations made by the Co-ordinate Bench in CRL.M.C. 6487/2024 filed by this petitioner along with Ms. Kalpana Advocate impugning an order passed by the District Judge dismissing an application seeking transfer of its case. The observations at paragraph 8, 16 to 18 are relevant.:

“8. A perusal of the abovementioned table shows that the Petitioner has filed transfer petitions seeking transfer of cases from the Court of **five** different judges. It cannot be said that every judge, against whom transfer petitions were filed by the Petitioner, is biased against the Petitioner.

.....

16. Mere perception of suspicion or apprehension of bias is not sufficient to entertain a plea of transfer. A perusal of the grounds raised by the Petitioner for transfer of the case or in the present Petition, **does not show** that the Judge overseeing the proceedings was biased in any manner against the Petitioner. This Court is of the opinion that the present Petition is only a method to **put pressure** on the Judge hearing the case of the Petitioner. This Court cannot ignore the fact that Order transferring a case from one Court to another or from one Judge to another casts an aspersion on the Judge and on his/her reputation. Withdrawing cases from a Judge on mere allegations of biasness without there being a reasonable belief will be prejudicial to the independence of judiciary. Learned Principal District and Sessions Judge is the best person to take a decision as to whether the case should be transferred or not and after looking into the facts and circumstances of the present case, the conduct of the Petitioner, the allegations made by the Petitioner and the Order sheets of the Magistrate Court, the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge has come to the conclusion that the Magistrate is not acting in a biased manner and the apprehension of biasness claimed by the Petitioner is completely unwarranted.

17. In view of the above, this Court, while sitting in



revisionary jurisdiction, is not inclined to interfere with the decision taken by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge as nothing has been brought out in the present Petition which would persuade this Court to interfere with the Order passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, which is a well-reasoned Order.

18. Accordingly, the Petition is dismissed, along with the pending applications, if any.”

(Emphasis supplied)

15. The aforesaid order of the Co-ordinate Bench records that petitioner along with Ms. Kalpana, Advocate has filed five (5) transfer petitions, which were all dismissed.

16. This Court in its order dated 06.03.2025 has already noted that even while filing this petition, petitioner and Ms. Kalpana, Advocate made a false non-filing declaration at paragraph ‘46’.

17. **These facts bring out a glaring pattern of the conduct of the petitioner and his wife Ms. Kalpana, who acts as his Advocate in this litigation that they have been casually restoring to unfair practices.** Further action on the show cause notice dated 06.03.2025 and reference to Bar Council on the next date, Ms. Kalpana, Advocate is put to notice on the said issue as well.

18. In the meantime, **having regard to the aforesaid Rules of Bar council of India, Ms. Kalpana is cautioned against undertaking any filing of petitions/pleadings or making any representation on behalf of the petitioner before any Court as an advocate. This Court further notes that Ms. Kalpana being the wife of the petitioner is directly interested in the outcome of the litigation pending between the petitioner and respondent no. 2, which as is evident from the facts of this case has resulted in interference with the administration of justice and has fomenting litigation.”**

[Emphasis Supplied]

7. On 15.05.2026, arguments on the show cause notice were concluded. Ms. Kalpana, represented through her counsel, Ms. Kajal Chandra stated that there had been an inadvertent error in not making a disclosure of



CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012 and the dismissal order dated 18.12.2012. She offered a verbal apology on behalf of Ms. Kalpana. She, however, stated on instructions that Ms. Kalpana is unwilling to file a written unconditional apology and pay costs to purge the contempt.

II. REPLY FILED BY MS. KALPANA TO THE SHOW CAUSE NOTICE

8. In response to the show cause notice dated 06.03.2025, Ms. Kalpana submitted that the allegations levelled against her were misconceived and sought discharge of the notice. At the outset, she stated that any omission in the writ petition was wholly inadvertent and attributable to *lapse of memory*, as the earlier quashing petition, CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012, had been filed nearly twelve years prior. According to her, there was no deliberate suppression of facts or intention to mislead the Court. She further alleged that the Court had been misled by the submissions of respondent no. 2's counsel, whom she accused of acting out of personal vendetta against herself and her husband.

8.1. Ms. Kalpana also contended that the present writ petition was fundamentally distinct from the earlier quashing petition. She submitted that CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012 sought quashing of the summoning order dated 08.06.2007 and the complaint itself, whereas the present writ petition sought quashing of the *continuing* criminal proceedings on the ground that the original complaints had allegedly been destroyed and were never exhibited before the Trial Court. She asserted that the reliefs, factual foundations, nomenclature and circumstances in the two proceedings were materially different, and therefore the present petition could not be regarded as a repetition of the earlier proceedings.



2026:DHC:6684



8.2. She also asserted that the orders dated 18.12.2012 (dismissing the earlier quashing petition) and 10.07.2018 had already been placed before the Court by way of additional documents e-filed on 16.11.2024 under Diary No. 5277059/2024 as well as through Crl. M.A. No. 34579/2024 under Section 340 CrPC. According to her, since these orders already formed part of the judicial record, the allegation of deliberate suppression was unfounded.

8.3. Ms. Kalpana also disputed the reliance placed upon the orders dated 28.05.2018 and 10.07.2018 passed by Court of the Special Judge in Crl. Rev. Petition No. 165/2018. She contended that those orders did not contain any adverse findings against her personally. She submitted that the counsel appearing for the petitioner in the proceedings culminating in the order dated 10.07.2018 was Mr. Satya Prakash Yadav, Advocate, and that the observations recorded therein were not directed against her. Likewise, she asserted that although her name appeared in the order dated 28.05.2018, no adverse observations had been recorded against her conduct. She further stated that she had been in legal practice since the year 2010 and had maintained an unblemished professional record.

8.4. In answer to the allegation of deliberate suppression, Ms. Kalpana questioned the very motive attributed to her, contending that there was no conceivable advantage in concealing the earlier proceedings, particularly when the respondent was fully aware of the litigation history and would inevitably bring the same to the notice of the Court. She maintained that the omission, if any, could not be construed as wilful or intentional.



8.5. A substantial portion of the reply was devoted to alleging personal bias and professional misconduct on the part of Mr. Joginder Pal Singh, Advocate, appearing for respondent no. 2. Ms. Kalpana alleged that he had instigated the present contempt proceedings to settle personal scores and to divert attention from complaints and criminal proceedings allegedly pending against him. In support of these allegations, she furnished an extensive list of litigation involving Mr. Joginder Pal Singh before the Supreme Court, the BCD, the Bar Council of India, various criminal courts and the Delhi High Court, contending that he had himself faced allegations of professional misconduct, forgery, cheating and unethical conduct in several matters.

III. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

9. Upon hearing all parties, this Court reserved judgment on the show cause notice issued to Ms. Kalpana and on the question whether proceedings under the Act of 1971, and disciplinary proceedings before the BCD ought to follow.

10. As noted above, it was brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner, represented by Ms. Kalpana, Advocate, had earlier filed CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012 seeking quashing of the same criminal complaint, which was dismissed on 18.12.2012, but the said fact was not disclosed in the present petition. It was stated that the declaration of non-filing at paragraph 46 of the subject writ petition was therefore false. Taking note of the alleged suppression of material facts, this Court, by order dated 06.03.2025, issued a show cause notice to Ms. Kalpana to explain why proceedings under the Act of 1971 and reference to BCD for initiation of disciplinary proceedings should not be made. The Court appointed an



Amicus Curiae to examine the record and assist the Court. In response, Ms. Kalpana denied any deliberate suppression, attributing the omission to *inadvertence*, also contending that the earlier and present petitions were distinct in nature and reliefs sought, and asserted that the earlier proceedings had been subsequently brought on record.

11. It is pertinent to note that at the first hearing of the CRL.M.C. No. 3870/2012, the High Court had recorded that there was delay and laches on behalf of the petitioner in approaching the Court. The relevant order dated 07.11.2012 read as under:

“1. This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by virtue of which the petitioner is seeking quashing of a complaint in complaint case bearing No.1440/1/2007 titled Ms. Sonia Mendiratta Vs. Harjeet Singh Mendiratta initiated by the respondent no.2, who happens to be the sister of the petitioner on the ground that the dispute between the parties is essentially civil in nature.

2. On enquiry, the petitioner has pointed out that though the complaint was filed in the year 2007 and the petitioner had put in appearance before the Court for the first time on or about 8.6.07, however, the petition is being filed now when the counsel was engaged, there is inordinate delay and laches in approaching the Court for quashing.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks time to satisfy this Court that the delay and laches are not a ground for not entertaining the petition.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

Thereafter, the High Court vide order dated 18.12.2012 dismissed the petition and the said order reads as under:

“This is a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the summoning order dated 8.6.2007 as well as for quashing of the criminal complaint titled *Sonia Mendiratta vs. Harjeet Singh*



Mendiratta bearing No. 1440/1/2007 pending before the Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Courts, for an offence under Sections 323/341/451/506/509 IPC.

The ground for quashing which has been set up by the learned counsel is that the dispute between the petitioner and the respondent No.2 is essentially a civil dispute in respect of the property purported to have been left by their deceased mother. The learned counsel was granted time to satisfy this court as to why there was a delay in approaching this court for quashing of the summoning order dated 8.6.2007 as well as the complaint. The learned counsel has not been able to give any cogent explanation for the same.

The order of summoning is an order against which revision would lie. Since the revision itself has to be filed within a period of 90 days, which period has already expired long back, the petitioner under the garb of the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., cannot be permitted to assail the order of summoning.

So far as the quashing of the complaint is concerned, the ground which has been set up, is that the dispute between the petitioner and the respondent No.2 is essentially a civil dispute. With regard to the filing of the petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., this court has already held in Criminal M.C. No.1656/2011, titled *Rajesh Chetwal Vs. State* that although no period of limitation is prescribed for invoking the jurisdiction of this court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. but it must be invoked within a reasonable time. The reasonable time though has not been prescribed but obviously the delay of more than five years as in the instant case, for which no explanation has been furnished, can hardly be considered to be reasonable. On the contrary, the learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn the attention of the court to the list of dates in the case, detailed at page No. 115, wherein it is clearly reflected that the trial court has already recorded some part of the pre-charge evidence.

That being the position, I feel that this petition is hit by inordinate delay and laches in approaching the court only with regard to foreclose the learned trial court to decide the question of the guilt of the petitioner on merits. **I feel that the petition is totally misconceived, hit by delay and laches and deserve to be dismissed.**



The petition is accordingly dismissed.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

12. In view of the filing of Crl. M.C. No. 3870/2012 and the order and order of dismissal dated 18.12.2012, the present writ petition could not have been filed and maintained by the petitioner. The petitioner therefore wilfully suppressed this fact and filed a false declaration at paragraph 46 of the writ petition. The relevant paragraph 46 reads as under:

“46. That the Petitioner has **not filed any other similar petition seeking quashing of criminal proceedings** arises from the complaints in question either before this Hon'ble Court or before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

13. The explanation tendered by Ms. Kalpana for the non-disclosure has to be examined in light of the obligations cast upon an advocate appearing before a Constitutional Court. An advocate occupies a dual position. While representing the interests of the client fearlessly, an advocate simultaneously functions as an officer of the Court and is under an equally compelling obligation to assist the Court by making a full, fair and accurate disclosure of all fact material to the adjudication of the *lis*.

14. It would be relevant to refer to the statutory framework governing professional conduct of advocates. Section 49(1)(c) of the Advocates Act, 1961, wherein in accordance with the powers vested on Bar Council of India to make Rules, it has framed ‘Standards of Professional Conduct and Etiquette’ under Bar Council of India Rules [‘BCI Rules’] at Chapter II of Part VI, which emphasise that an advocate shall not employ improper means



to influence judicial proceedings, shall exercise independent professional judgment, shall prevent the client from adopting unfair practices, and shall refrain from fomenting litigation. Departure from these standards constitutes professional misconduct attracting the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Bar Council under Section 35 of the Advocates Act, 1961. The relevant BCI Rules read as under: -

“3. An advocate shall not influence the decision of a court by any illegal or improper means. Private communications with a judge relating to a pending case are forbidden.

4. An advocate shall use his best efforts to restrain and prevent his client from resorting to sharp or unfair practices or from doing anything in relation to the court, **opposing Counsel** or parties which the advocates himself ought not to do. An advocate shall refuse to represent the client who persists in such improper conduct. He shall not consider himself a mere mouth-piece of the client, and shall exercise his own judgment in the use of restrained language in correspondence, avoiding scurrilous attacks in pleadings, and using intemperate language during arguments in court.

.....

9. An Advocate should **not** act or plead in any matter in which he is himself pecuniarily interested.

Illustration:

I. He should not act in a bankruptcy petition when he himself is also a creditor of the bankrupt.

II. He should not accept a brief from a company of which he is a director.

.....

13. An advocate should not accept a brief or appear in a case in which he has reason to believe that he will be a witness, and if being engaged in a case, it becomes apparent that he is a witness on a material question of fact, he should not continue to appear as an Advocate if he can retire without jeopardising his client's interests.

.....



15. It shall be the duty of an advocate fearlessly to uphold the interests of his client by all fair and honourable means without regard to any unpleasant consequences to himself or any other. He shall defend a person accused of a crime regardless of his personal opinion as to the guilt of the accused, bearing in mind that his loyalty is to the law which requires that no man should be convicted without adequate evidence.

.....

18. An advocate shall not, at any time, be a party to **fomenting of litigation.**”

[Emphasis Supplied]

1. Section 2(c) of the Act of 1971, which define criminal contempt to include acts which prejudice or interfere with the due course of judicial proceedings or obstruct the administration of justice. In this Court’s opinion, where pleadings are drafted, by the filing advocate, with deliberate suppression of material judicial proceedings known to the advocate, such conduct may have the tendency to interfere with the proper administration of justice by preventing the Court from considering the matter in its correct factual and procedural perspective.

2. The legal principles governing the duties of advocates have repeatedly been emphasised by the Supreme Court. In **Pandurang Dattatraya Khandekar v. Bar Council of Maharashtra**¹, the Supreme Court observed that it is professionally improper for an advocate to prepare pleadings knowing the allegations contained therein to be untrue and that conduct diminishing public confidence in the legal profession may amount to professional misconduct. The relevant paragraph reads as under: -

¹ (1984) 2 SCC 556, at paragraph no. 10.



“10. Nothing should be done by any member of the legal fraternity which might tend to lessen in any degree the confidence of the public in the fidelity, honesty and integrity of the profession. For an advocate to act towards his client otherwise than with utmost good faith is unprofessional. It is against professional etiquette for a lawyer to give improper legal advice with an ulterior object. It is unworthy that an advocate should accept employment with such motive, or so long as his client has such understanding of his purpose. **It is professionally improper for a member of the bar to prepare false documents or to draw pleadings knowingly that the allegations made are untrue to his knowledge.** Thus, the giving of improper legal advice may amount to professional misconduct. That however may not be so by the giving of wrong legal advice.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

Similarly, in **Saumya Chaurasia v. Enforcement Directorate**², the Supreme Court reiterated that every advocate, being an officer of the Court, is expected to diligently verify material facts and fairly assist the Court in the administration of justice. The relevant paragraph read as under: -

“14. It cannot be gainsaid that every party approaching the court seeking justice is expected to make full and correct disclosure of material facts and that every advocate being an officer of the court, though appearing for a particular party, is expected to assist the court fairly in carrying out its function to administer the justice. It hardly needs to be emphasized that a very high standard of professionalism and legal acumen is expected from the advocates particularly designated Senior advocates appearing in the highest court of the country so that their professionalism may be followed and emulated by the advocates practicing in the High Courts and the District Courts. **Though it is true that the advocates would settle the pleadings and argue in the courts on instructions given by their clients, however their duty to diligently verify the facts from the record of the case, using their legal acumen for which they are engaged, cannot be obliterated.**”

[Emphasis Supplied]

² (2024) 6 SCC 401, at paragraph no. 14.



The recent decision of the Supreme Court in **Jitender @ Kalla v. State of GNCTD & Ors., SLP (Crl.) 4299/2024**, while dealing with the conduct expected from an Advocate on Record, is also relevant as it would directly apply to the filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana, the relevant extract at paragraph 44(i) reads as under:

“44(i)..... Therefore, when incorrect facts are stated in the petition/appeal/counter affidavit or when material facts or documents are suppressed, the advocate-on record cannot shift the entire blame on either the client or his instructing advocates. Therefore, it is his duty to be cautious and careful. **His duty is to file proper proceedings and affidavits before this Court to assist the court in dispensing justice. He must always be fair to the Court and effectively assist the Court in deciding cases. The duty of the advocate-on-record does not end after filing a case or a counter...**”

[Emphasis Supplied]

3. The issue before this Court is not merely whether the petitioner possessed a legal right or an independent cause of action for maintaining the present writ petition. Equally important is whether there existed a duty to candidly disclose the complete history of prior litigation concerning the same criminal proceedings so as to enable this Court to evaluate the maintainability and merits of the petition with the benefit of the entire factual background. The obligation of disclosure is foundational to the exercise of writ jurisdiction, where relief is discretionary and premised upon utmost good faith by the litigant and counsel alike. This obligation is equally upon the filing advocate who has knowledge of the litigation.

4. The subsequent production of documents on 16.11.2024 after the issue was brought to the notice of the Court by respondent no. 2 does not, by itself, answer the concern which prompted the issuance of the show cause



notice on 06.03.2025. The relevant question is whether the material facts were fairly disclosed at the time the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court was invoked and whether the pleadings, as originally presented, accurately reflected the earlier judicial proceedings. Similarly, the plea that the earlier petition of the year 2012 was drafted by another advocate does not, by itself, resolve the issue, particularly when Ms. Kalpana has acknowledged her close involvement in the litigation, both as the petitioner's spouse, his SPA and as the advocate handling the present proceedings.

5. Having perused the entire record, this Court is of the considered opinion that the conduct of filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana cannot be viewed as a mere error or an inadvertent omission. Ms. Kalpana is the spouse of the petitioner and his SPA holder. The declaration contained in paragraph 46 of the present writ petition, asserting that no earlier proceedings seeking identical relief had been filed, was therefore made despite her direct and personal knowledge to the contrary. Such a false declaration strikes at the foundation of the administration of justice, as the Court proceeds on the basis that the statements made in pleadings, particularly mandatory declarations, are true, accurate and complete. The pleadings are accompanied by affidavits.

6. The bald explanation offered by Ms. Kalpana does not inspire confidence. In fact, it shows lack of candour. Although, learned counsel, Ms. Kajal Chandra, tendered an oral apology on behalf of Ms. Kalpana before the Court, as recorded in the order dated 20.12.2025, she expressly declined to tender a written apology. No unconditional apology was ever tendered by Ms. Kalpana. Despite sufficient opportunity, she neither accepted



responsibility for the false declaration nor expressed any remorse. On the contrary, in her reply to the show cause notice, she sought discharge on merits and attempted to justify the conduct in question. In these circumstances, this Court finds no expression of genuine contrition or acceptance of responsibility that would warrant taking a lenient view for Ms. Kalpana. In fact, this Court gets a distinct impression that Ms. Kalpana even now does not accept the responsibility for the misconduct and does not even realise that it is her obligation as an advocate to make full disclosure. In fact, this Court finds from the demeanour of Ms. Kalpana that she has little or no regard for her conduct of wilful suppression and interference with administration of justice. This Court is of the considered view that Ms. Kalpana fails to realise her obligation towards her duty as an officer of the Court and the duty to make a fair disclosure.

7. This Court also cannot ignore the broader factual matrix emerging from the record. The material placed before this Court, including the tabulated statement of proceedings furnished by learned counsel for respondent no. 2 detailing the multiple proceedings instituted by the petitioner and Ms. Kalpana against advocates representing respondent no. 2, Judicial Officers and witnesses connected with the litigation; (i) the observations recorded by the learned Special Judge in Criminal Revision No. 165/2018 by order dated 10.07.2018 noticing suppression of the dismissal of the earlier revision petition and dismissing the revision with costs; (ii) the findings of the learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, South District, Saket Courts, in Criminal Revision No. 95/2023 by order dated 18.03.2023 recording that the petitioner had instituted as many as



seven (7) revision petitions in the same complaint case and holding such conduct to be an abuse of the process of law; (iii) the order dated 27.07.2024 dismissing the petitioner's transfer petition and; (iv) the observations of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRL.M.C. 6487/2024, which noticed that the petitioner had repeatedly instituted transfer petitions against different judicial officers without any reasonable basis and observed that such petitions appeared to be a method of *exerting pressure* upon the judiciary; collectively disclose a *consistent* pattern whereby the petitioner, assisted by Ms. Kalpana, has repeatedly instituted proceedings against advocates representing respondent no. 2, judicial officers and witnesses connected with the litigation, with an intent to obstruct the legal proceedings. The present false declaration is therefore *not* an isolated incident but forms part of a continuing course of conduct by the petitioner and the filing advocate, Ms. Kalpana which tends to obstruct and interfere with the due administration of justice.

8. Equally significant is the dual role assumed by Ms. Kalpana throughout the litigation. She has simultaneously acted as the petitioner's advocate, his SPA holder and, being his spouse, possesses a direct personal interest in the outcome of the dispute. The record demonstrates that this dual role has blurred the distinction between an advocate's professional obligations and her personal interest in the litigation. An advocate is under a duty not merely to advance the cause of a client but also to act as an officer of the Court, to ensure fairness in judicial proceedings, to prevent resort to unfair practices and to refrain from fuelling litigation.

9. The conduct noticed in the present case is wholly inconsistent with



these obligations and prima facie discloses violations of standards of professional conduct expected of an advocate and embodied in Part VI, Chapter II of the Bar Council of India Rules, 1975, particularly Rule 5 which obligates an advocate to prevent unfair practices, exercise independent professional judgment and refrain from making improper pleadings, as well as Rules 6 and 7, which require an advocate to act only by fair and honourable means and *prohibit* fomenting of litigation. Such conduct may attract disciplinary action under Section 35 of the Advocates Act, 1961.

10. In the opinion of this Court, the acts attributed to Ms. Kalpana are not confined to professional misconduct alone. Deliberately filing a petition containing a false non-filing declaration with knowledge of the earlier proceedings, thereby attempting to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court on a fundamentally misleading premise, constitutes conduct having a direct tendency to interfere with and obstruct the due course of judicial proceedings and the administration of justice. Such conduct squarely falls for consideration within the ambit of criminal contempt under Section 2(c) of the Act of 1971.

11. Since criminal contempt, other than contempt in the face of the Court, is required to be dealt with by the Division Bench in accordance with the Act of 1971 and Contempt of Courts (Delhi High Court) Rules, 2025 governing contempt jurisdiction, and is required to be tried as such. Accordingly, this Court considers it appropriate to direct the registry to place the matter before Hon'ble the Chief Justice for appropriate orders, to place the matter before the concerned Division Bench.



12. Simultaneously, the material on record discloses a strong case warranting examination by the disciplinary authority under the Advocates Act, 1961. Whether the conduct of Ms. Kalpana amounts to professional misconduct in violation of the Bar Council of India Rules, 1975 is a matter falling within the statutory jurisdiction of the BCD. The disciplinary process under the Advocates Act, 1961 operates in a distinct field and is independent of proceedings under the Act of 1971. Consequently, a reference to the BCD is both necessary and appropriate.

13. Further, this Court is satisfied that permitting Ms. Kalpana to continue representing the petitioner in these proceedings or in any proceedings arising out of Complaint Case No. 463048/2016, or any other legal proceedings between the parties herein, would seriously undermine the fairness of the judicial process. Having regard to her admitted personal involvement, her status as the petitioner's spouse and SPA holder, the repeated findings recorded by various Courts regarding the vexatious conduct of the litigation, and the findings recorded herein, it is imperative to ensure that the inter-se proceedings are insulated from any further interference. Accordingly, in order to protect the purity of judicial proceedings, Ms. Kalpana is restrained from acting, appearing, filing pleadings or otherwise representing the petitioner as an advocate in the present proceedings or in any proceedings arising out of or connected with Complaint Case No. 463048/2016, leaving it open to the petitioner to engage any other Advocate of his choice.

14. In view of the foregoing discussion, the following directions are issued:



14.1 The Registry is directed to forward, within *two weeks*, a copy of this judgment along with the complete record of the present proceedings to the BCD for consideration of initiation of disciplinary proceedings against Ms. Kalpana, Advocate, under Section 35 of the Advocates Act, 1961.

14.2 The Registry is further directed to register a suo moto criminal contempt proceeding and place the present matter, together with this judgment and the relevant record, before Hon'ble the Chief Justice for obtaining appropriate orders for placing the matter before the appropriate Division Bench, on 01.09.2026.

This judgment is pronounced in the open Court and hence the petitioner is aware of this direction for appearing on 01.09.2026.

14.3 Till the conclusion of the aforesaid proceedings and subject to any orders that may be passed by the competent forum, Ms. Kalpana, Advocate, shall not act, appear, file pleadings, sign Vakalatnama or otherwise represent the petitioner in any proceedings arising out of or connected with the petitioner herein, in her professional capacity as an Advocate. The petitioner shall, however, remain at liberty to engage any other Advocate of his choice.

15. This Court will now deal with the writ petition. The petitioner instituted the present writ petition with material facts having been suppressed and thereby abused the process of this Court. The subsequent dismissal of the impugned complaint, rendering the writ petition infructuous, cannot have the effect of effacing or overlooking such conduct. The invocation of the jurisdiction of this Court by withholding material facts is a serious matter and cannot be permitted to be swept under the carpet merely



2026:DHC:6684



because the substantive proceedings have subsequently become infructuous. Such conduct warrants appropriate costs. Accordingly, the petitioner is imposed with costs of Rs. 1 lakh to be paid to Delhi High Court Bar Clerk's Association³ and Rs. 1 lakh to be paid to Shaurya Foundation Trust⁴ within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of this judgment.

16. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the writ petition stands dismissed.

17. Pending applications, if any, stands disposed of.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J
AUGUST 14, 2026/rhc/AM/IB

³ A/c No. 15530100006282

⁴ C/A 15530210000793 UCO BANK, Delhi High Court