

2023 LiveLaw (SC) 608

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
VIKRAM NATH; J., AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH; J.
Criminal Appeal No(s). 577/2007; 01-08-2023

GULSHAN BAJWA versus REGISTRAR, HIGH COURT OR DELHI & ANR.

The Supreme Court vacated a stay order in a 16-year-old criminal appeal as it pulled up the appellant-lawyer for seeking repeated adjournments.

For Appellant(s) Mr. Gulshan Bajwa, Appellant-in-person

For Respondent(s) Mr. Kanhaiya Singhal, AOR Mr. Jasmeet S. Chadha, Adv. Mr. Ujwal Ghai, Adv. Mr. Udit Bakshi, Adv. Mr. Prasanna, Adv. Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR Mr. Ardhendumauli Kumar Prasad, AOR Mr. Deepak Goel, AOR

ORDER

Application for permission to appear and argue in person is allowed.

This matter(s) is pending since 2007. The appellant appears in-person to argue this matter from day one. This Court while admitting the appeal, granted an interim order to the effect that the operation of the impugned order shall remain stayed vide order dated 16th April, 2007. Thereafter, on more than dozen occasion the cases were listed, it was either adjourned on the request of the appellant or on account of his absence. It is pending for more than 16 years. Today also when the cases are taken up, the appellant is present in-person and has moved an application for adjournment of the matter(s) till post Diwali Vacation. The appellant has sought to place before us his medical prescriptions to point out that he is not keeping well and has to undergo surgery. We offered to the appellant to provide legal assistance from the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee but he has complaint against the legal aid counsel also, just as he had been making complaints and irresponsible statements and comments against Judges of the Delhi High Court and other Courts for which he has been found guilty of contempt. Even the Bar Council of India, to which authority the matter was referred for examination, has also found that his conduct is not proper and the order of guilt against him does not require any further alteration. The continuous insistence is for adjournment although we find him to be very eloquent and vocal in his delivery and remembering everything regarding the case(s) and is not willing to argue the matter(s). In that view of the matter, we vacate the interim order dated 16th April, 2007.

List on 28th November, 2023.

© All Rights Reserved @LiveLaw Media Pvt. Ltd.

*Disclaimer: Always check with the original copy of judgment from the Court website. Access it [here](#)