



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.2 OF 2026**

Ashim Deb

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. Krishna Gangadharrao Paldewar

2. Madhuri Avinash Anand

.. Respondents

Mr. Ashim Deb, the Petitioner is present in-person.

None for the Respondent.

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, CJ. &  
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.**

**DATE : 18<sup>TH</sup> FEBRUARY 2026.**

**P.C. :**

1. The petitioner, who is a teacher and a social worker, appearing in person, has filed a Criminal Contempt Petition making allegations against a sitting Judge and a former Judge of the Additional Sessions Court no.2 at Panvel, District Raigad, in respect of proceedings conducted by them in discharge of their judicial work. The petitioner has sought the following prayers:

*“A. Initiate criminal contempt proceedings against the contemnor, Shri Krishna Gangadharrao Paldewar, for willful disobedience, obstruction of justice, and actions undermining the dignity of the Hon'ble Court. 8. To prevent the continued degradation of the institution of justice and the erosion of its integrity, all judicial assignments entrusted to the contemnor may be withheld.*

*C. Pass appropriate orders to ensure that the contemnor No. 2. is held accountable for her misconduct and recommend disciplinary action.*

*D. Direct the Registrar General of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court to conduct a detailed inquiry into the allegations of fabrication and tampering of court records.*

*E. The Hon'ble High Court may be pleased to initiate SUO A40rz7 contempt proceedings against the contemnors.*

*F. Grant any other relief deemed fit and proper by this Hon'ble Court in the interest of justice.”*

2. At the outset, we must observe that the present petition is wholly misconceived and constitutes a gross abuse of the process of law. Contempt jurisdiction under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 cannot be invoked against judicial officers for acts done by them in discharge of their judicial functions.

3. The petition states that the petitioner is facing trial in Special Case No.60 of 2021 arising out of C.R. No.29 of 2021 before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, wherein charges have been framed against the petitioner under the provisions of Sections 3(1)(w)(i), 3(1)(w)(ii), 3(1)(s), and 3(1)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, along with Sections 354, 352, 504, 506, and 34 of the Indian Penal Code as well as Sections 37(1)(a), 37(3), and 135 of the Maharashtra Police Act, 1951. There is also a civil dispute being Regular Civil Suit No.197 of 2020, which is pending between the original informant and the petitioner relating to immovable property. A transfer application bearing Criminal Application no. 56 of 2023 and Criminal Writ Petition no.5355 of 2022 is also filed in this Court. The grievance of the petitioner appears to be that certain applications preferred by him in the course of the criminal proceedings have not been allowed and he contends that the Trial Court failed to take cognizance of the submission of a forged caste certificate by the informant, which prejudiced his defence and on that basis, he alleges denial of a fair trial by the learned Judges.

4. Upon perusal of the petition, we find that the allegations made against the respondents are wholly unfounded, reckless, and lacking in substance. Judicial orders are subject to challenge before the competent appellate or revisional forum. The remedy of the petitioner, if aggrieved by any judicial order, lies in availing the appropriate statutory remedies available in law. Merely because

the learned Judges have passed orders adverse to the petitioner, the same cannot furnish any ground whatsoever to initiate proceedings against judicial officers. The tenor and contents of the petition indicate that such statements have been made with the apparent intent to browbeat the learned Judges. Such conduct amounts to interference with and obstruction of administration of justice and cannot be countenanced. This petition appears to be calculated to malign the reputation of the concerned judicial officers and to undermine public confidence in the judicial system.

5. Ordinarily, this is a fit case for imposition of exemplary costs and for initiation of contempt proceedings against the petitioner. However, considering the fact that the petitioner is appearing in person, we refrain from doing so. Criminal Contempt Petition no.2 of 2026 is dismissed. The petitioner is cautioned that if any such frivolous or misconceived proceedings are instituted in future, appropriate action including contempt shall be initiated against him. The Registrar (Judicial-I) is directed to forward a copy of this order to the Courts seized of the above-mentioned matters.

**[ GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J. ]**

**[ CHIEF JUSTICE ]**