$~7 (SDB)

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of Decision: 29th October, 2025

\+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 16/2024**

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION .....Petitioner

versus

NITIN BANSAL .....Contemnor/Respondent

Through: Mr. M.C. Dhingra, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Nihal Ahmad & Mr. H. R. Khan, Mr. Kashif Salman, Advs. along with Contemnor - Mr. Nitin Bansal. (M: 7983528756, 8130230009)

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA

ORAL

1. This hearing has been conducted through hybrid mode.

2. The present criminal contempt case filed under Section 15 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 *(hereinafter, 'the Act'),* arises out of order dated 28th October, 2024, passed by the ld. Single Judge in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** titled ***Bina & Ors. v. Ashok Bansal.***

3. The brief background, giving rise to the present contempt proceedings is that ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** was filed by the Petitioners therein under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The said petition was filed seeking interim relief against the Contemnor's father, Mr. Ashok Bansal, in relation to disposal of 30,000 tons of industrial coal

material.

4. In the said petition, on 31st May, 2024, the ld. Single Judge passed an order, restraining the Contemnor's father, Mr. Ashok Bansal from dealing with the 30,000 tons of industrial coal. The said order was passed in following terms:

> ***"13. In view of the averments contained in the petition; considering the documents appended therewith; and based on the submissions made at the Bar, the respondent is restrained from dealing with the 30,000 tons of industrial coal that was subject matter of purchase by late Sh. Balkishan Goyal in any manner; or from transferring, alienating or creating any lien, encumbrance or charge over any assets of the partnership firm in the name and style of M/s G&G Concrete Solutions, created vide Amended Partnership Deed dated 18.01.2023, till the next date of hearing."***

5. However, after passing of the abovementioned order, another application being ***I.A. 33013/2024*** was filed in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** by the Petitioners therein seeking appointment of a Local Commissioner. The appointment was sought on the ground that in stark violation of the order dated 31st May, 2024, the Respondent therein *i.e.*, the father of Contemnor had been disposing of the 30,000 tons of industrial coal and had also been alienating his assets. Thus, an assessment of the ground position was sought by appointment of a Local Commissioner.

6. Accordingly, on 12th July, 2024 the Court in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** had appointed one Ms. Nandini Bali, Advocate as the Local Commissioner in the said case. The local commission was to be executed within the jurisdiction of P.S. Bhupani, Faridabad. The said order dated 12th

July, 2024, passed by the ld. Single Judge in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** reads as under:

> ***"6. This Court, therefore, appoints Ms. Nandini Bali, Advocate (Mob: 9810155735) as a Local Commissioner to visit the premises of the respondent of M/s. G&G Concrete Solutions situated at Mustkil No. 47, Kila No. 25 (3-0), MustkilNo. 48, Kila No. 20/2(3-9), 21(8- 0), 22(8-0), Mustkil No. 23 (8-0), Mustkil No.-62, Kila No. 5/1 /2(1- 17), with a total area of 31 Kanal & 10 Mario, Moja Bhupani, Faridabad - 121002, and submit a report as to whether there has, or has not, been breach of the order passed by this Court. The petitioner would be entitled to depute one representative to accompany the learned Local Commissioner while executing the commission.***
>
> *7. The learned Local Commissioner shall be entitled to requisition police assistance, should it become necessary, to execute the commission. In that event, this order shall operate as a directive to the authorities at Police Station Bhupani, Faridabad to provide all necessary assistance to ensure that the commission is properly executed.*
>
> *8. The respondent, or its representatives who may be present at the site, are directed to cooperate with the peaceful execution of the commission. The learned Local Commissioner shall also execute commission peacefully without unnecessarily disturbing the legitimate business activities of the respondent.*
>
> *9. If, in executing the commission, the Local Commissioner is required to effect forced ingress into any premises, she shall be at liberty to do so.*

> *10. The learned Local Commissioner may also, if she deems it appropriate, take photographs, or videograph the premises, the expenses for which would be borne by the petitioner.*
>
> *11. The learned Local Commissioner shall be entitled to consolidated fees of Rs. 1 lakh, apart from incidental expenses at actuals for executing the commission. The fees of the learned Local Commissioner shall be payable in advance of execution of the commission."*

7. Further to the order dated 12th July, 2024, the Local Commissioner, along with the police officials, visited the premises on 13th July, 2024 at about 12:08 PM. During the course of inspection, the Contemnor/Respondent who is stated to be the son of the Respondent in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024***, entered the premises at about 12:23 PM, and his conduct and behaviour, as reported in the Local Commissioner's Report dated 17th September, 2024, is extracted as under:

> "*12. It is recorded that, at this stage, one, Mr. Nitin Bansal appeared at the subject site at 12:23 PM and started to record the Local Commission being executed. I then proceeded to enquire about his relation with the respondent and his presence at the subject site. However, he refused to answer or even stand at one place and talk. He was extremely rude and uncooperative. Therefore, the police officers intervened and asked him to behave in a proper manner. Further, the police officers asked Mr. Nitin Bansal to delete the recording taken by him and ensured the same was done.*
>
> *13. Subsequently, I was informed that Mr. Nitin Bansal is the son of the respondent, who was speaking with his Advocate telephonically. At this*

stage, the respondent requested me to speak with his counsel, i.e., Mr. Aditya Mishra (Advocate). Thereafter, I had a telephonic conversation with the counsel for the respondent and apprised him of the Court order. In response thereto, the counsel for the respondent assured that he has explained the directions of this Hon'ble Court to his clients and requested me to proceed with the execution of the Local Commission.

14. Pursuant thereto, I proceeded with the inspection and requested the respondent to produce the statement of account/books of account of M/s G&G Concrete Solutions. However, I was informed that all the statements of account/books of account are in the custody of his Chartered Accountant ("CA"), i.e., Mr. Gyan Chand Gupta.

***15**. It is also pertinent to mention that at this stage, Mr. Ashok Bansal, Mr. Nitin Bansal and one, Mr. Sonu Gupta became extremely aggressive on enquiring about the work, bills, statement of accounts, etc., pertaining to the business. **Further, Mr. Nitin Bansal went to the extent of taking out a weapon (pistol) and keeping it on the table in the office unit at the subject premises to threaten me and create coercion**. Furthermore, Mr. Ashok Bansal started to raise his voice and throw certain documents in an extremely rude manner. Thus, the police officials intervened and also took cognizance of the weapon (pistol) for further investigation, as upon enquiry it was stated by the respondent that the said weapon (pistol) is without any license. Therefore, the weapon (pistol) has been seized by the ASI and is presently in his custody for investigation."*

8. The Report filed by the local commissioner contained various

allegations against the Contemnor/ Respondent to the effect that when the local commission was being executed, there was a complete non-cooperative attitude on behalf of the Contemnor and attempts were made to intimidate the Local Commissioner. Further, to threaten the Local Commissioner and the other members, the Contemnor placed a pistol on the table in the midst of execution of the commission. The said pistol was confiscated by the police as it was suspected that the same was un-licensed.

9. Accordingly, upon perusal of the Local Commission Report furnished by the Local Commissioner, the ld. Single Judge, *vide* order dated 28th October, 2024 referred the matter to this Court for initiating contempt proceedings against the Contemnor/Respondent after observing that there is a *prima facie* case of interference with the administration of justice amounting to criminal contempt under Section 2(c)(iii) of The Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. The said order dated 28th October, 2024, passed by the ld. Single Judge in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** reads as under:

> *"9. A reading of paragraphs No.12, 13 & 15 of the report of the Local Commissioner shows that Mr. Nitin Bansal took out the pistol and kept it on the table to threaten and coerce the Local Commissioner. Even assuming that the stand of the Respondent is correct that the pistol in question was already present on the table then also, in the considered opinion of this Court, there was no necessity for the pistol to be kept on the table at the time when the Local Commissioner was visiting the premises because keeping a weapon on the table in itself is sufficient to intimidate any person. Further, the affidavit filed by Mr. Nitin Bansal states that the pistol in question is only a Toy Gun which is kept in the premises to scare animals and monkey. This Court fails to understand as to how a Toy Gun*

without pellets can scare animals and monkeys. Therefore, the stand taken by Nitin Saxena does not satisfy this Court at this juncture.

10. In view of the report of the Local Commissioner and the statement of the ASI of PS Bhupani, who stated that when he entered the office room, the pistol (Air Gun) was present on the table, this Court is of the opinion that prima facie a case of interference with administration of justice is made out which amounts to criminal contempt. Mr. Nitin Bansal has prevented an officer of the Court, who had gone for carrying her duties assigned by the Court.

11. Accordingly, the Registrar General of this Court is requested to place the records of the proceedings before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice for referring the case to the concerned Division Bench handling cases of Criminal Contempt against Mr. Nitin Bansal."

10. Pursuant to the said Reference, the present contempt proceedings were initiated against the Contemnor/Respondent and on 9th December, 2024 notice was issued and the Contemnor/Respondent was directed to file his reply by the next date of hearing, showing cause as to why contempt action ought not to be initiated against him.

11. In reply to the show-cause ssissued to him, the Contemnor/Respondent submitted his response stating that he was cooperative with the Local Commissioner and at no point attempted to influence or obstruct the inspection process. It is also stated that the allegations that the Contemnor/Respondent took out a pistol and placed it on the table to intimidate the Local Commissioner are baseless.

12. It is the case of the Contemnor that the alleged object was not a firearm but a toy gun used to scare away stray animals and the said toy gun was lying on the office table prior to the inspection, which unintentionally got mixed with a pile of papers. Further defence taken by the Contemnor/Respondent is that he, being a law-abiding citizen with no prior criminal record, could not have engaged in such reckless conduct. On these grounds, it was prayed by the Contemnor that the contempt proceedings be dropped.

13. Thereafter, upon considering the reply of the Contemnor/Respondent, this Court, on 21st February, 2025 directed that a status report be called from the concerned SHO, P.S. Bhupani, Faridabad as to the events that transpired on 13th July, 2024 when the local commission in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** was being executed. The concerned Sub-Inspector, P.S. Bhupani, Faridabad was also directed to produce the weapon which was seized by the Local Commissioner and kept in his safe custody. The directions in the order dated 21st February, 2025 are as under :

> *"6. The Local Commissioner's report states that the gun is in the custody of the concerned Sub-Inspector, P.S. Bhupani, Faridabad. In this view of the matter, let a status report be called from SHO, P.S. Bhupani, Faridabad as to the events that transpired on 13th July, 2024 when the local commission in* ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** *was being executed.*
>
> ***7. The concerned Sub-Inspector, P.S. Bhupani, Faridabad would also produce the weapon which was seized by the Local Commissioner and kept in his safe custody.***

8. Ld. Counsel for the Delhi Police shall coordinate with SHO, P.S., Bhupani, Faridabad to file the said status report by the next date of hearing.

9. The Contemnor/Respondent to remain present on the next date of hearing."

14. Pursuant to the above directions, the gun which was seized from the Contemnor/Respondent was produced before the Court by ASI Samsher Singh, PS Bhupani, Faridabad on 28th May, 2025 and the following order was passed:

"2. Pursuant to the directions passed by this Court on 21st February, 2025, ASI Samsher Singh, PS Bhupani, Faridabad has produced the gun which was seized from the Contemnor/Respondent.

3. The seal of the package containing the seized gun has been opened before the Court. The same has been seen by the Court. It is clear that the seized gun is not a toy gun but a real air gun.

4. Let the same be returned to the ASI Samsher Singh, PS Bhupani, Faridabad, who shall re-seal it and preserve it for the next date of hearing.

5. List on 8th August, 2025 for hearing of the submissions on behalf of the Contemnor/Respondent. The contemnor shall remain present in Court on the next date of hearing."

15. The matter was finally heard on 8th September, 2025 and submissions were concluded by both parties. Upon query, the Contemnor/Respondent maintained his stance that he is completely innocent. However, ld. Senior Counsel who appeared for the Respondent had tendered an unconditional

apology on his behalf. The matter has then been reserved for Orders and the Contemnor was directed to appear before the Court today *i.e.,* 29th October, 2025.

16. We have heard ld. Counsels for both parties and have examined the material on record.

17. Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, defines *"Criminal Contempt",* as follows:

> *"(c) "criminal contempt" means the publication (whether by words, spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representations, or otherwise) of any matter or the doing of any other act whatsoever which —*
>
> *(i) scandalises or tends to scandalise, or lowers or tends to lower the authority of, any court; or*
>
> *(ii) prejudices, or interferes or tends to interfere with, the due course of any judicial proceeding; or*
>
> *(iii) interferes or tends to interfere with, or obstructs or tends to obstruct, the administration of justice in any other manner;"*

18. The scope and object of contempt jurisdiction have been highlighted by the Supreme Court in ***Ram Kishan v. Tarun Bajaj, (2014) 16 SCC 204,*** wherein the Apex Court has observed as under:-

> *"11. The contempt jurisdiction conferred on to the law courts power to punish an offender for his wilful disobedience/contumacious conduct or obstruction to the majesty of law, for the reason that respect and authority commanded by the courts of law are the greatest guarantee to an ordinary citizen that his rights shall be protected and the entire democratic fabric of the society will crumble down if the respect*

of the judiciary is undermined. Undoubtedly, the contempt jurisdiction is a powerful weapon in the hands of the courts of law but that by itself operates as a string of caution and unless, thus, otherwise satisfied beyond reasonable doubt, it would neither be fair nor reasonable for the law courts to exercise jurisdiction under the Act. The proceedings are quasi-criminal in nature, and therefore, standard of proof required in these proceedings is beyond all reasonable doubt. It would rather be hazardous to impose sentence for contempt on the authorities in exercise of the contempt jurisdiction on mere probabilities[....]

12. Thus, in order to punish a contemnor, it has to be established that disobedience of the order is "wilful". The word "wilful" introduces a mental element and hence, requires looking into the mind of a person/contemnor by gauging his actions, which is an indication of one's state of mind. "Wilful" means knowingly intentional, conscious, calculated and deliberate with full knowledge of consequences flowing therefrom. It excludes casual, accidental, bona fide or unintentional acts or genuine inability. Wilful acts does not encompass involuntarily or negligent actions. The act has to be done with a "bad purpose or without justifiable excuse or stubbornly, obstinately or perversely". Wilful act is to be distinguished from an act done carelessly, thoughtlessly, heedlessly or inadvertently. It does not include any act done negligently or involuntarily. The deliberate conduct of a person means that he knows what he is doing and intends to do the same. Therefore, there has to be a calculated action with evil motive on his part. Even if there is a disobedience of an order, but such disobedience is the result of some compelling circumstances under which it was not possible for the contemnor to

> *comply with the order, the contemnor cannot be punished. "Committal or sequestration will not be ordered unless contempt involves a degree of default or misconduct."*

19. The Supreme Court, in ***Jhareswar Prasad Paul v. Tarak Nath Ganguly, (2002) 5 SCC 352***, has observed as under:-

> *"11. The purpose of contempt jurisdiction is to uphold the majesty and dignity of the courts of law, since the respect and authority commanded by the courts of law are the greatest guarantee to an ordinary citizen and the democratic fabric of society will suffer if respect for the judiciary is undermined."*

20. In the present case, the only plea raised by the Contemnor is that the alleged object used to threaten the local commissioner was a toy gun and not a real gun. As already recorded above, in order to ascertain the correct position as to the nature of the gun, this Court vide order dated 21st February, 2025, had directed the concerned Sub-Inspector, P.S. Bhupani, Faridabad to produce the gun.

21. Accordingly, on 28th May, 2025, ASI Samsher Singh, PS Bhupani, Faridabad produced the gun before the Court. The same was examined by the Court and was found to be a real gun and not a toy gun, as was being canvassed by the Contemnor. ASI Samsher Singh, PS Bhupani, Faridabad, who was present in Court on the said date of hearing also confirmed this position that the gun was not a toy gun.

22. Thus, clearly, the plea of the Contemnor/ Respondent was a false, misleading plea and was taken only to pull wool over the eyes of the Court,

with the hope that the Court would never call for the physical gun itself.

23. The narration of the facts above would show that the acts of the Contemnor/Respondent with the Local Commissioner constituted a clear threat to the Local Commissioner to not to execute the commission. The Contemnor is engaged in business activities alongside his father, Mr. Ashok Bansal, and also operates an independent enterprise.

24. As discussed above, the ld. Single Judge had appointed a Local Commissioner to ascertain as to whether there was a breach of interim order dated 31st May, 2025 passed by the ld. Single Judge in ***O.M.P. (I) (COMM.) 186/2024*** which was also interfered with by the Contemnor. The contemnor has indulged in abusive conduct against the Local Commissioner. Hence, there was a clear interference in the course of judicial proceedings.

25. A Local Commissioner appointed by any Court is an extension of the Court itself, as has been held in the recent decision of the Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Court on its own Motion v. M/s Obsession Naaz & Ors. (2025:DHC:7206-DB).*** In the said case, the Court was dealing with contempt proceedings initiated against persons who were alleged to have beaten up and threatened the local commissioners appointed by the Court. The Court has condemned such action by parties who interfere in the execution of the Local Commission. The relevant portion of the said decision reads as under:

> *"81. Advocate Commissioners were given the task to visit shops, prepare inventory of counterfeit products being sold under the trademark "Samsung" and the oval slanted logo or any other mark deceptively similar to the Plaintiff"s trademark. The Advocate Commissioners were directed to seize all such articles, seal them and then release them on*

> *Superdari with directions to produce them before the Court as and when required.* ***The Court Commissioners have been brutally beaten up by the Contemnors, striking terror in their minds and forcing them to flee from the place****. The facts reveal that the idea was to dissuade Local Commissioners from performing the work assigned to them by the Court.* ***Interfering with the work assigned to the Advocate Commissioners amounts to interference in the administration of justice. If such of those persons who have interfered with the administration of justice are not dealt with heavy hands, the majesty of law will come down in the eyes of ordinary citizens which will have a deleterious effect on the fabric of the society. It is, therefore, imperative; rather, duty of the Court, to ensure that people who interfere in the administration of justice are dealt with severely so that people respect and adhere to law for the rule of law to prevail."***

26. This Court in ***Court on Its Own Motion Versus Sanjay Rathod (Advocate)*** (***2024:DHC:6390-DB***), observed that in cases where the conduct and language used by the Contemnor scandalizes the Court, interferes in the administration of justice, the same shall be considered to be contempt on the face of the Court. The relevant paragraphs are extracted hereinbelow:

> *"15. This question has been squarely answered in both the decisions cited by the Ld. Amicus. In* ***Bathina Ramakrishna Reddy vs. State of Madras*** *(supra) the Supreme Court while deciding on the corresponding provision i.e. Section 2(3) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1926, held that the jurisdiction of the High Cout in such cases is only barred where the acts that constitute*

contempt of a subordinate Court are punishable as contempt under specific provisions of the Indian Penal Code and not where these acts amount to offences of other description for which punishment has been provided for in the Indian Penal Code. The relevant portion of the said judgment is extracted hereinunder:

"10. ***In our opinion, the sub-section referred to above excludes the jurisdiction of the High Court only in cases where the acts alleged to constitute contempt of a subordinate court are punishable as contempt under specific provisions of the Penal Code but not where these acts merely amount to offences of other description for which punishment has been provided for in the Penal Code. This would be clear from the language of the sub-section which uses the words "where such contempt is an offence" and does not say "where the act alleged to constitute such contempt is an offence".*** *It is argued that if such was the intention of the legislature, it could have expressly said that the High Court's jurisdiction will be ousted only when the contempt is punishable as such under the Penal Code. It seems to us that the reason for not using such language in the sub-section may be that the expression "contempt of court" has not been used as description of any offence in the Penal Code, though certain acts which would be punishable as contempt of court in England, are made offences under it.""*

27. Further, in the facts of the present case, this Court has also ascertained the fact that the plea being taken by the Contemnor before the Court that the alleged gun is a toy gun is a dishonest and contumacious plea. At each and every stage, therefore, it is clear that the Contemnor has left no stone

unturned in committing illegalities after illegalities. Yet, the Contemnor shows no remorse. The unconditional apology tendered by the Contemnor is nothing but a lip service. Thus, owing to the deliberate obstruction by the Contemnor, this Court does not find it appropriate to accept the apology tendered.

28. It is also the settled position in law that for any apology to be accepted by the Court, it has to be meaningful, genuine and *bona fide* which in this case it is not.

29. Thus, plea of the contemnor that the said gun was a toy gun is found to be false and is accordingly rejected. The gun which was seized by the police and subsequently produced before this court, has been verified and found to be a real air gun. The photograph of the gun, as placed on record, clearly shows the presence of the said gun on the table at the premises where the local commission was conducted. The said picture is extracted hereinbelow:

Photograph No. 18: office unit of respondent at subject site; Photograph No. 19: weapon (pistol) in the office unit of the respondent at subject site.

30. This Court is of the view that the non-cooperative conduct of the Contemnor, coupled with the fact that the gun was placed on the table by him during the course of the proceedings being conducted by the Local Commissioner, as recorded in the report of the Local Commissioner, sufficiently demonstrates that the Contemnor intended to obstruct the task entrusted to her by the Court. Such conduct on the part of the Contemnor reflects a deliberate attempt with evil motive towards the interference in the administration of justice, and therefore, contemnor is liable to be punished for criminal contempt.

31. The Court, therefore, holds that the conduct of the Contemnor clearly constitutes criminal contempt. Accordingly, in terms of Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, the Contemnor is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month along with Rs.2,000/- as fine. If there is non-payment of fine, the sentence shall extend for a further period of 15 days.

32. It is directed that the police authorities shall take Contemnor into custody from the Court itself and the Contemnor be sent to Jail.

33. The contempt petition is accordingly disposed of in the above terms, along with pending applications, if any.

34. Order *dasti* under the signatures of Court Master has been provided to the Contemnor.

35. Order of this Court be uploaded *forthwith.*

36. Copy of this order be communicated to the concerned Jail Superintendent for necessary information and compliance.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE

RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA
JUDGE

OCTOBER 29, 2025
abk/sds/ss

$~7 (SDB)

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 16/2024**

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION .....Petitioner

Through:

versus

NITIN BANSAL .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Nihal Ahmad, Mr. H. R. Khan, Ms. Sabiha Fatima and Mr. Kashif Salman, Advs. along with Contemnor - Mr. Nitin Bansal. (M: 7983528756, 8130230009)

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA

O R D E R

% 29.10.2025

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

2. Today, vide a separate detailed order, the contempt case has been disposed of and the Contemnor/Respondent has been held guilty of criminal contempt under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Accordingly, the Contemnor has been sentenced to one month simple imprisonment in the following terms.

> *"30. This Court is of the view that the non-cooperative conduct of the Contemnor, coupled with the fact that the gun was placed on the table by him during the course of the proceedings being conducted by the Local Commissioner, as recorded in the report of the Local Commissioner, sufficiently demonstrates that the Contemnor intended to obstruct the task entrusted to her by the Court. Such conduct on the part of the Contemnor reflects a deliberate attempt with evil motive towards the interference in the administration of justice, and*

therefore, contemnor is liable to be punished for criminal contempt.

31. The Court, therefore, holds that the conduct of the Contemnor clearly constitutes criminal contempt. Accordingly, in terms of Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, the Contemnor is sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of three months along with Rs.2,000/- as fine. If there is non-payment of fine, the sentence shall extend for a further period of 15 days.

32. It is directed that the police authorities shall take Contemnor into custody from the Court itself and the Contemnor be sent to Jail.

33. The contempt petition is accordingly disposed of in the above terms, along with pending applications, if any."

3. At this stage. ld. Counsel for the Contemnor submits that there is a wedding in the family of the Contemnor and thus, he prays that the Contemnor be permitted to surrender on 6th November, 2025 before the concerned Jail Superintendent.

4. Accordingly, it is directed that the Contemnor shall voluntarily surrender before the concerned Jail Superintendent, Central Jail No.2, Tihar, New Delhi on 6th November, 2025.

5. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent, Central Jail No.2, Tihar, New Delhi for information and compliance of the order.

6. If the Contemnor does not surrender on the said date, the concerned Jail Superintendent is free to take action in accordance with law.

7. Let a copy of this order as also the order of sentence be communicated

to Mr. Sanjay Lao, ld. Standing Counsel (Criminal).

8. No further orders are called for in this matter.

9. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J

RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA, J

OCTOBER 29, 2025
dk/ss