



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJA VIJAYARAGHAVAN V

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. JAYAKUMAR

WEDNESDAY, THE 8<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JULY 2026 / 17TH ASHADHA, 1948

CONT.CAS. (CRL.) NO. 2 OF 2024

PETITIONER:

JANARDHANA SHENOY K  
AGED 33 YEARS  
8/1176, T D EAST GATE, KOCHI, PIN - 682002

BY ADV SHRI.SURIN GEORGE IPE

RESPONDENTS:

KUMBAKUDI SUDHAKARAN  
AGED 73 YEARS, S/O. RAMUNNI,  
LAL VIHAR, KIZHUNNA P.O., KANNUR DISTRICT,  
PIN - 670007

BY ADVS.  
SRI.P.MARTIN JOSE  
SHRI.V.S.CHANDRASEKHARAN  
SRI.VIJU THOMAS  
SRI.THOMAS P.KURUVILLA  
SHRI.AJAY BEN JOSE  
SRI.MANJUNATH MENON  
SHRI.SACHIN JACOB AMBAT  
SHRI.HARIKRISHNAN S.  
SRI.R.GITESH  
SRI.S.SREEKUMAR (SR.)

THIS CONTEMPT OF CASE (CRIMINAL) HAVING COME UP FOR FINAL HEARING ON 08.07.2026, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



## **ORDER**

### **Raja Vijayaraghavan V, J.**

On 03.08.2019, the respondent delivered a speech in which several statements were made concerning the learned Judges who had rendered the judgment in W.A. No. 628 of 2018. During the course of the speech, the respondent is stated to have made certain remarks and cast aspersions on the learned Judges, which, according to the petitioner, were derogatory in nature and had the effect of lowering the dignity and authority of the Court.

2. Aggrieved by the aforesaid statements, the petitioner approached the learned Advocate General by filing a Sanction Petition under Section 15(2) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, seeking the requisite sanction for initiating contempt proceedings against the respondent.

3. By order dated 30.04.2021, the learned Advocate General came to the conclusion that the respondent had made a public speech describing the judgment rendered in W.A. No. 628 of 2018 as "മോശമായ വിധി" and had made scandalising statements about the learned Judges who delivered the judgment. Sanction was thus accorded to the petitioner to initiate proceedings under the Act.

4. When the matter came up for consideration before this Court on



05.02.2024, this Court had issued notice to the respondent.

5. Thereafter, when the matter came up for consideration on 19.06.2026, it was submitted before this Court that the respondent sincerely regrets having made such a statement in the course of his extempore speech and that he never intended to defame, malign, or cast any aspersion on the integrity, impartiality, dignity or authority of this Court or of the learned Judges. It was submitted that the respondent desires to tender his sincere, unconditional and unqualified apology and wants to assert that no disrespect was ever intended. It was also submitted that the respondent shall exercise greater restraint and caution in future.

6. In view of the said submission, this Court directed the respondent to appear in person and file an affidavit tendering his unconditional apology after admitting the contempt.

7. The respondent has appeared in person before us. He has also filed an affidavit, the relevant portion of which reads as under:

6. I state that the impugned expression, was made spontaneously in a moment of anger, frustration and emotional distress arising out of the circumstances prevailing at that particular point of time. The statement was purely momentary and impulsive in nature and was not the result of any deliberate, calculated or malicious intent.

7. I respectfully submit that I have always held the judiciary, and in particular the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in highest esteem and regard. I have unwavering faith in the institution and the rule of law.



8. I further state that I never intended to defame, malign, or cast any aspersion up on the integrity, impartiality, dignity, or authority of the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala or any Hon'ble Judge thereof.

9. Up on reflection, I realize that the words used by me may have been inappropriate. I sincerely regret the same and unconditionally withdraw any such statement.

10. I tender my sincere, unconditional, and unqualified apology to this Hon'ble Court for the said expression. I respectfully assure this Hon'ble Court that no disrespect was ever intended and that I shall exercise grater restrain and caution in the future.

11. I respectfully pray that this Hon'ble Court may graciously accept my apology and take into consideration the fact that the statement was an isolated momentary utterance mad in anger and not deliberate attempt to undermine the dignity authority or majesty of this Hon'ble Court.

8. Rule 14(a) of the Contempt of Courts (High Court of Kerala) Rules, 1988, if a respondent tenders an unconditional apology after admitting he has committed the contempt, the Court may proceed to pass such orders as it deems fit.

9. The contemnor reiterated the statements made in the affidavit. He stated that the statement was an isolated utterance, was not deliberate, and was not intended to undermine the dignity, authority or majesty of this Court. He further stated that he shall exercise greater restraint in future.

10. After hearing the respondent and the learned counsel, we are satisfied that the apology tendered by the respondent is bona fide and genuine and is in



consonance with the requirements of Rule 14(a) of the Contempt of Courts (High Court of Kerala) Rules, 1988.

11. In that view of the matter, we accept the unconditional apology tendered by the respondent, and he is discharged.

The Contempt Case is accordingly closed.

Sd/-

**RAJA VIJAYARAGHAVAN V,  
JUDGE**

Sd/-

**K.V. JAYAKUMAR,  
JUDGE**