

CRM-27143-2025 in CRM-M-28149-2024
RAVNEET KAUR V/S STATE OF PUNJAB

Present: Ms. Ravneet Kaur- petitioner in person.

The present application has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. (*now Section 528 of BNSS*) read with Section 15(6(b) of The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter to be referred as 'SC/ST Act') and Article 14 and 21 of Constitution of India seeking preponment of the main case from 31.10.2025.

A perusal of the headnote to CRM-27143-2025, the application for preponement of the main case, indicates that an attempt has been made by the petitioner to browbeat the judges entrusted with the adjudication of her cases. The same is reproduced below:

“An Application Under Section 482 Cr.PC (528 BNSS) read with provisions of SC/ST (Section 15 (6(b)) (POA) Act 1989 and Article 14 and 21 of Constitution of India to issue appropriate orders in the circumstances of the case to comply with provisions of SC/ST (Section 15 (6(b)) (POA) Act 1989 and Article 14 and 21 of constitution of India by preponing the main case from 31.10.2025 to any earliest date else petitioner would be left with only option to implead Justice Sh. Sandeep Moudgill, Justice Sh. Harpreet Singh Brar and Sh. Baljinder Singh ASJ as party to file SLP before Hon'ble Supreme Court of India to decide the preset case as per provisions of SC/ST (Section 15 (6(b)) (POA) Act 1989 and Article 14 and 21 of Constitution of India because deliberately and intentionally Justice has been denied by curtailing the fundamental and legal rights of the petitioner and delaying the present applications and main petition just to cause harassment to the petition to put the petitioner under pressure to withdraw the present complaints against IPS Gurpreet Singh

Bhullar as mentioned in order dated 28.03.2025 without consent of the petitioner.”

The petitioner appearing in person contends that her case is not being taken up with the intention to harass her. Moreover, she claims that order dated 28.03.2025 in the present matter was passed by a Co-ordinate bench without her consent. The said order is reproduced below:

“ In compliance of the order dated 26.03.2025, Mr. Gurpreet Singh Bhullar, IPS, Commissioner of Police, is present in Court and gives an undertaking that FIR No.0049 dated 16.04.2024, under Sections 186 & 353 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Cantonment, Amritsar, Punjab, has been investigated and the concerned Investigating Officer is in the process of preparing a cancellation report, which is likely to be done within one week.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG Punjab further undertakes that a copy of such cancellation report will be furnished to the petitioner, who is appearing in person in the present petition.

As far as any other complaint is concerned, wherein the statements have been got recorded against the petitioner by certain unknown persons or civilians, who are neither Advocates nor the police officials qua the alleged cancellation of licence of the petitioner by the Bar Council, the same will be closed if found not to be correct and true, also within a period of one week from today and a copy of order so passed in the complaint shall thereafter be conveyed to the petitioner in the next three days.

In the light of above, assurance given by Mr. Gurpreet Singh Bhuller, IPS, Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, petitioner is satisfied and does not want to press the instant petition any further, who will not pursue the present complaint as well, which is pending with the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar.

To await the response, as per the undertaking given by Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, post this matter on 08.04.2025.

Personal appearance of Officer, shall remain exempted till further orders.”

The case was previously listed before a Co-ordinate bench of this Court and was consistently heard since 29.05.2024. However, vide order dated 26.05.2025, the matter was ordered to be listed before another bench as

the earlier Bench recused itself from hearing the same. Consequently, on orders from Hon'ble the Chief Justice, the matter was listed before this Bench on 29.05.2025 for the first time, when it was adjourned to 06.06.2025 on request of the petitioner. Subsequently, the matter was heard over summer break by the Vacation Bench on 06.06.2025 and 18.06.2025.

Thereafter, the present case was listed before this Bench on 14.07.2025. However, on the said day, the matter could not be taken up due to a heavy cause list of 191 cases inclusive of the cases listed specially under the Mediation of Nation Drive. Accordingly, the case was adjourned to 31.10.2025. Today as well about 245 cases were listed before this Court. While the petitioner did not present any justifiable reasons to support her prayer for preponement, the matter was taken up on her insistence. She was also offered assistance by this Court by means of the High Court Legal Aid Services.

A perusal of the record indicates no reasons that could justify making such scandalous allegations by the petitioner. In fact, not only has she failed to indicate how she has been intentionally victimized in the matter at hand, she has also made scandalous remarks attacking the integrity of the justice dispensation mechanism. Thus, this Court is constrained to note that the pleadings of the petitioner are *per se* contemptuous. Since the petitioner is not a layperson but a qualified Advocate, it cannot be assumed that the said unceremonious behaviour stemmed out of lack of knowledge. Further still, a Constitution bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***M.Y. Shareef and another Vs. The Hon'ble Judges of the High Court of Nagpur 1955 SCR (1) 757***, has opined that even an Advocate who has signed the petition containing scandalous allegations against the Courts would also be liable to

be held for contempt. Speaking through Justice M.C. Mahajan, has opined as follows:

*“11. The fact however remains, as found by the High Court, that there was at the time these events happened considerable misconception amongst a section of the Nagpur Bar about advocates' responsibilities in matters of signing transfer applications containing allegations of this character. **It cannot be denied that a section of the Bar is under an erroneous impression that when a counsel is acting in the interests of his client, or in accordance with his instructions he is discharging his legitimate duty to his client even when he signs an application or a pleading which contains matter scandalising the Court.** They think that when there is conflict between their obligations to the Court and their duty to the client, the latter prevails. **This misconception has to be rooted out by a clear and emphatic pronouncement, and we think it should be widely made known that counsel who sign applications or pleadings containing matter scandalising the Court without of reasonably satisfying themselves about the prima facie existence of adequate grounds therefor, with a view to prevent or delay the course of justice, are themselves guilty of contempt of Court, and that it is no duty of counsel to his client to take any interest in such applications; on the other hand, his duty is to advise his client for refraining from making allegations of this nature in such applications.** Once the fact is recognised as was done by the High Court here, that the member of the Bar have not fully realised the implications of their signing such applications and are firmly under the belief that their conduct in doing so is in accordance with professional ethics, it has to be held that the act self of the two appellants in this case was do under a mistaken view of their rights and duties, and in such cases even a qualified apology may well be considered by a Court.”*

It is clear that the reckless allegations made by the petitioner were intended to bring disrepute to the justice administration system. The act of the petitioner is an attempt at intimidating the adjudicatory authority which *prima facie* amounts to interference in the judicial process. The unwarranted and unjustified challenge to the authority of the Courts undermines the dignity of the rule of law. Furthermore, such scandalous remarks have the potential of shaking the very edifice of the judicial system which would inevitably shake the faith of the public in the institution. Therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to issue a notice under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to the

petitioner to show cause as to why contempt proceedings may not be initiated against her.

While there is no justification to prepone the main case i.e. CRM-M-28149-2024, in the interest of justice, the present application is allowed.

List on 29.08.2025.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

22.07.2025
Ajay Goswami