



2026:DHC:4423-DB



\$~2 & 3

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

*Date of decision: 16.05.2026*

+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 3/2025 & CRL.M.A. 2184/2026,**  
**CRL.M.A. 9152/2026, CRL.M.A. 15810/2026**  
+ **CONT.CAS.(CRL) 4/2025**

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Harsh Prabhakar, Adv.  
(Amicus Curiae) with  
Mr.Dhruv Chaudhry,  
Mr.Shubham Sourav and  
Mr.Vijit Singh, Adv.  
Mr.Vivek Kumar Tandon, Adv.  
(DHCLSC) with Ms.Laxmi  
Gupta, Adv.

versus

SHIV NARAYAN SHARMA ADV. AND ORS.  
DEEPAK SINGH, ADVOCATE AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Gulshan Pahuja, R-2 present  
in person.  
Mr.Aman Usman, APP with  
Mr.Manvendra Yadav, Adv for  
the State.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA**

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. We, by our judgment dated 21.04.2026, had found the respondent no.2/Mr.Gulshan Pahuja (hereinafter referred to as



2026:DHC:4423-DB



‘contemnor’) guilty of having committed criminal contempt of Court as defined in Section 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’) and granted him an opportunity to make submissions on the punishment to be awarded to him under Section 12 of the said Act. We, accordingly, issued a notice under Rule 13(1) of the Contempt of Courts (Delhi High Court) Rules, 2025 to him for the same, granting him liberty to file his submissions on punishment within a period of two weeks therefrom.

2. In response to the said notice, the respondent no.2 has filed an application being Crl. M.A. 15810/2026, praying for recall and setting aside of our judgment/order dated 21.04.2026 holding him guilty of having committed criminal contempt of Court. He further states that the conviction is vitiated and is violative of his rights under Articles 14, 20(3) and 21 of the Constitution of India and the principles of natural justice. He has also filed written submissions titled as ‘*written submission for debate on the quantum of sentence*’.

3. We have also granted him an opportunity of making oral submissions.

4. Mr.Pahuja, the contemnor, submits that our judgment dated 21.04.2026 suffers from a procedural irregularity inasmuch as he was not fully heard while holding him guilty of having committed criminal contempt of Court and that the case files on which he had made the comments in the subject videos were not summoned from the Trial Court nor were the judicial officers, who were named in the videos, produced as witnesses. He submits that he was not given any





2026:DHC:4423-DB



submissions, he again makes scandalous remarks inasmuch as he states that he expects no justice from the Indian judicial system and states '*adaalaton ki manmarzi badhti jaa rahi hai aur main koi nyay ki umeed nahi kar raha*' and also states '*manmarzi ka dusra arth taanashahi hota hai*'.

8. He submits that he will not ask for a reduction of sentence or expect justice from this Court. In fact, he started citing examples of freedom fighters and others who, on quantum of sentence, had taken a stand that they will not accept any leniency from the British government.

9. He further submits that as far as the respondent no.1 in both these contempt petitions are concerned, they were let off by accepting their apologies, thereby denying him a chance to prove his innocence by cross-examining them.

10. On the other hand, Mr.Prabhakar, the learned *Amicus Curiae*, submits that the above submissions of the contemnor are not relevant as far as the purposes of punishment are concerned, as they are in nature of seeking a recall/review of our judgment dated 21.04.2026. He submits that, in fact, from the submissions it is very clear that the contemnor has no regret for his actions and, in fact, is compounding the same even in his submissions made before the Court today.

11. He submits that the contemnor has shown no course correction or remorse and in fact, though by the order dated 14.05.2025 passed by a predecessor Bench of this Court, he had been directed not to upload any other videos making allegations against any judicial



2026:DHC:4423-DB



officer, however, the contemnor has brazenly continued to upload such videos. He submits that a report in this regard was also earlier submitted by him and in the response filed by the contemnor, he does not deny uploading these videos.

12. He submits that in the facts of this case, mere imposition of a fine will not suffice and it calls for imposition of punishment of imprisonment, which he leaves to the discretion of this Court. He, however, suggests that in case the punishment of imprisonment is awarded to the contemnor, he be asked if he intends to file an appeal against the same before the Supreme Court and if he answers in the affirmative, exercising power under Section 19(3) of the Contempt of Courts Act, the sentence be suspended by us for a period of 60 days, that is, the period of limitation for filing of the said appeal. The said course is also supported and suggested by the learned APP and the learned *Amicus Curiae* appointed by the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee.

13. We have considered the submissions made by the contemnor as also by the learned *Amicus Curiae(s)* and the learned APP.

14. In the present case, as found in our judgment dated 21.04.2026, the contemnor, by his acts, has scandalized the court and lowered the authority of the Court. The contemnor shows no regret for the same. He also does not suggest any course correction. In fact, he maintains that what he did was with the intent of improving the judicial system.

15. As noted by us in this order hereinabove, he, in fact, compounds his contempt by making further scandalous submissions before this



2026:DHC:4423-DB



Court and thus, evidently he is neither repentant nor deserves any mercy.

16. We also find that by not imposing adequate punishment on him, we may encourage him to repeat these acts in future and to embolden him in doing the same.

17. As far as his submissions on our judgment dated 21.04.2026 are concerned, we cannot sit in review of the said judgment and the contemnor has full right and had an opportunity to challenge the same in accordance with law. We, therefore, do not deem it fit to revisit all his submissions in our present order. The judgments cited by him are, therefore, not applicable to the facts of the present case.

18. Keeping in view the above, we are of the opinion that these cases call for the imposition of the maximum punishment on the contemnor. We, therefore, impose the punishment of simple imprisonment for a term of six months along with a fine of Rs.2000/- on the contemnor, that is, Mr.Gulshan Pahuja, in each of these matters. The sentence shall run concurrently for these matters. In failure to pay the fine in either or both the matters, we impose a further punishment of simple imprisonment of one month on the contemnor for the matter where he commits this default.

19. As the contemnor has stated that he intends to challenge our judgment dated 21.04.2026 and the order passed today before the Supreme Court, we, exercising our power under Section 19(3) of the Contempt of Courts Act, suspend the sentence awarded to the contemnor for a period of 60 days from today, subject to any further

