



CACP-95-2025

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

120

CACP-95-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: August 18, 2025

Inder Preet Singh

.....Appellant (s)

Vs.

Tejveer Singh IAS and another

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Appellant Inder Preet Singh, in person.

Ms. Kavita Arora, Advocate for the respondent No.2.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA J. (ORAL)

The present Contempt Appeal has been filed for setting aside the order dated 02.07.2025 passed by learned Single Judge in COCP No.3004-2025, whereby the contempt petition filed by the appellant, was dismissed.

2. Learned Single Judge, vide order dated 02.07.2025 dismissed the contempt petition after noting that previous contempt petition had already been dismissed, observing that the authority concerned had passed a speaking order.

3. The Writ Court had issued directions for consideration of the representation of the appellant. This claim of the appellant was considered and rejected. The previous contempt petition in that regard was dismissed as withdrawn after noticing the factum of compliance of the order. Thereafter, second contempt petition was filed, which has been dismissed by learned Single Judge vide order dated 02.07.2025 by imposing a costs of Rs.50,000/-.

4. Learned Single Judge has noticed that for any error in the speaking order passed by the authority, the remedy was to have it assailed in appropriate



CACP-95-2025

proceedings but filing a fresh contempt is not maintainable. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the learned Single Judge in dismissing the second contempt petition.

5. The appellant/petitioner, who is present in person, however submits that the filing of the second contempt petition was because the reasons on which his representation was rejected, were incorrect, and that it was an error in decision making to file contempt instead of challenging the order. It is, therefore, submitted that the imposition of costs be reduced.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 is gracious enough not to object to this part of the judgment.

7. Though the second petition ought not to have been filed, but we accept the submissions of the appellant that it was an error of judgment and in such view of the matter, the imposition of cost is waived.

8. The appeal stands disposed of accordingly.

9. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

**(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE**

**(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE**

August 18, 2025
sonia arora

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No
Whether reportable: Yes / No