

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE: C.R.P.Nos.242 & 361 of 2024

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
06.	5.9.2024	<p><u>RNT,J</u></p> <p><u>Review Petition in I.A.No.3 of 2024</u></p> <p>Sri Dr.K.A.Paul @ Kilavi Anand Paul, Review Petitioner has appeared party-in-person.</p> <p>2. On 28.08.2024, the Committee of Registrars granted permission to prosecute this case, appearing 'party-in-person'.</p> <p>3. In the CRPs, the Review petitioner was respondent. The CRPs were allowed on 18.06.2024.</p> <p>4. On hearing the Review petitioner, this Court finds that he is not to be permitted to appear in person, considering the way of submitting. Further, he stated, to quote "the Judge has gone so mad in passing the order", and when objected, he further stated that "I have been misunderstood. The said statement is for the 'District Judge'."</p>	

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		<p>5. The judgment under review is not by the District Judge.</p> <p>6. Learned District Judge(s) and any other Judicial Officer(s) are part of judicial system and play pivotal role in administration of justice. Use of such language by party-in-person, is highly condemnable.</p> <p>7. In Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate, in Re¹: the Hon'ble Apex Court, observed and held at Paragraph Nos.24 & 25 as under :</p> <p><i>“24. Thus, it is now settled that abuses, attribution of motives vituperative terrorism and scurrilous and indecent attacks on the impartiality of the Judges in the pleadings, applications or other documents filed in the Court or otherwise published which have the tendency to scandalize and undermine the dignity of the Court and the majesty of law amounts to criminal contempt of Court.</i></p> <p>25. While a litigant as also his lawyer have the freedom of expression and liberty to project their case forcefully, it must be remembered that they must while exercising that liberty maintain</p>	

¹ (1998) 7 SCC 248

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		<p><i>dignity, decorum and order in the Court proceeding. Liberty of free expression cannot be permitted to be treated as a licence to make reckless imputations against the impartiality of the Judges deciding the case. Even criticism of the judgment has to be in a dignified and temperate language and without any malice”.</i></p> <p>8. In <i>Roshan Lal Ahuja, in Re</i>²: the Hon'ble Apex Court, observed and held at Paragraph No.11 as under :</p> <p><i>“11. The tendency of maligning the reputation of judicial officers by disgruntled elements who fail to secure an order which they desire is on the increase and it is high time that serious note is taken of the same. No latitude can be given to a litigant to browbeat the Court. Merely because a party chooses to appear in person, it does not give him a license to indulge in making such aspersions as have the tendency to scandalize the court in relation to judicial matters.”</i></p> <p>9. The permission granted by the Committee of Registrars to the Review Petitioner to appear party-in-person is set aside.</p>	

² 1993 Supp (4) SCC 446

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		<p>10. Let the Review Petitioner appear through counsel.</p> <p>11. The Review Petitioner may also approach the Andhra Pradesh High Court Legal Services Committee for providing counsel, if so required.</p> <p>12. Post on 10.09.2024 as requested.</p> <p>13. Let a copy of this order be placed before the Registrar (Judicial).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">_____ RNT,J</p> <p>RPD</p>	

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE