

**2023 LiveLaw (SC) 884**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
DR. D.Y. CHANDRACHUD; CJI., J.B. PARDIWALA; J., MANOJ MISRA; J.  
Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s).966/2023; 13-10-2023  
ASHOK PANDEY *versus* UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

**Public Interest Litigation (PIL) - Frivolous PILs - Attempt to use the PIL jurisdiction to propagate some publicity - Imposition of Exemplary Costs - Frivolous PILs occupy the time and attention of the Court thereby deflecting the attention of the Court from more serious matters and consuming the infrastructure of the judicial manpower and Registry of the Court. Time has come when the Court should impose exemplary costs in such frivolous PILs. (Para 4)**

**Defective Oath - Allegation that the Chief Justice of the High Court did not use the expression "I" before his name during the oath, violating the Third Schedule of the Constitution and non-invitation of government representatives to the ceremony. The petitioner does not, as he possible cannot, dispute that the oath of office was administered to the correct person. The oath having been administered by the Governor and having been subscribed to after the administration of the oath, such objections cannot be raised. The Court dismissed the petition with costs of Rs 5,00,000. (Para 4)**

*For Petitioner(s) Petitioner-in-person*

**ORDER**

**1** The petitioner, who appears in person, states that he is aggrieved by what he described as a 'defective oath' administered to the Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay.

**2** The petitioner states that the Chief Justice did not use the expression "I" before his name while taking the oath, in contravention of the Third Schedule of the Constitution.

**3** The second grievance which he has set forth before the Court is that the representatives/Administrator of the Government of the Union Territory of Daman and Diu and Dadar and Nagar Haveli were not invited to the oath ceremony.

**4** The petitioner does not, as he possible cannot, dispute that the oath of office was administered to the correct person. The oath having been administered by the Governor and having been subscribed to after the administration of the oath, such objections cannot be raised. This is only a frivolous attempt to use the PIL jurisdiction to propagate some publicity for the petitioner. We are clearly of the view that such frivolous PILs occupy the time and attention of the Court thereby deflecting the attention of the Court from more serious matters and consuming the infrastructure of the judicial manpower and Registry of the Court. Time has come when the Court should impose exemplary costs in such frivolous PILs. We accordingly dismiss the petition with costs of Rs 5,00,000, which shall be deposited by the petitioner in the Registry of this Court within a period of four weeks. If the cost is not deposited within the aforesaid period, the same shall be collected as arrears of land revenue through the Collector and District Magistrate at Lucknow.

**5** Pending application, if any, stands disposed of.