

**Reserved On : 24/01/2025**  
**Pronounced On : 04/02/2025**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**

**R/MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION (FOR CONTEMPT) NO.2559 of  
2024**

**FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:**

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. SUPEHIA**

**Sd/-**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE GITA GOPI**

**Sd/-**

Approved for Reporting	Yes	No
	√	

**GUJARAT OPERATIONAL CREDITORS ASSOCIATION  
ACTING THROUGH MS. PRITI CHAUDHARY  
Versus**

**ARCELOR MITTAL NIPPON STEEL INDIA LTD. & ORS.**

**Appearance:**

MR DEEPAK KHOSLA, ADVOCATE for

MR. JAYDEEP M SHUKLA(6974) for the Applicant(s) No. 1

MR.MIHIR JOSHI, SENIOR ADVOCATE with

MR.KEYUR GANDHI, MR RAHEEL S. PATEL, MS ISHA HAKIM &

MR YASH DADHICH, ADVOCATES for the respondents

**CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. SUPEHIA**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE GITA GOPI**

**CAV JUDGMENT**

**(PER : HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. SUPEHIA)**

1. We are confronted with a very unacquainted and disingenuous application seeking conviction of the respondents along with the advocates representing them under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1947 (for short "the Act").

2. The captioned Misc. Civil Application (consisting of 668 pages, including 111 pages of Memo) is filed by the applicant - Association under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act,

1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India. The prayer clauses of the present application suggest that the applicant is praying for punishment for civil contempt of courts repeatedly committed between 02.09.2024 and 21.10.2024 of the judgment of three Judges Bench of this Court delivered in the case of District Development Officer vs. Maniben Virabhai, (in Special Civil Application No.642 of 1994, decided on 25.04.2000), and two Judges Bench in the case of Jakhariya Saleman Manek and Anr. vs. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and Ors., (in Writ Petition (PIL) No.4 of 2023 decided on 04.10.2024).

**BRIEF REFERENCE TO THE ALLEGED CONTEMPTUOUS ACTION BY THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR ADVOCATES:**

3. The applicant in the present application has alleged and prayed for initiating the following contemptuous actions against the respondents and the learned advocates representing them.

4. The first contemptuous action, which is alleged to have occurred on 30.09.2024, pertains to the appearance of the learned senior advocates *viz.*, learned senior advocate Mr.Mihir Joshi, who was joined and supported on his demand by other learned senior advocates *viz.* Mr.Mihir Thakore and Mr.Rashesh Sanjanwala, by alleging that only one learned senior counsel is permitted to appear in the matter per party and they have appeared on instructions of the Advocate-on-Record (AoR) *i.e.* learned advocate Mr.Keyur Gandhi in violation of the ratio of the judgment passed by three Judges Bench in the Case of ***Maniben Virabhai (supra)***.

5. The second contemptuous action, which is alleged to have happened on 01.10.2024, also relates to the learned senior counsels, who had urged the learned Single Judge to extend the interim order granting ad-interim relief on 08.08.2024, stating to be against the ratio laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of High Court Bar Association, Allahabad v. State of U.P. and Ors., (passed in Criminal Appeal No.3589 of 2023, decided on 29.02.2024).

6. The third contemptuous action, alleged to have happened on 03.10.2024, which is in the reference to the learned senior counsels seeking extension of the ad-interim order.

7. Similarly, the fourth contemptuous action alleged to have occurred on 01.10.2024, also relates to the learned senior counsels, who had mentioned that *“if the Special Civil Application is decided, the CA will be taken care of”*.

8. The fifth contemptuous action pertains to the consolidation of all the aforesaid contemptuous actions, state to have happened on the aforesaid dates, wherein the ad-interim order was extended at the request of the learned senior counsels, alleging as flagrant contumacious in defiance to the ratio laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of **High Court Bar Association, Allahabad (supra)**.

9. The sixth contemptuous action, as alleged, has occurred on 21.10.2024, wherein it is alleged that the learned senior counsels appearing for the respondent - Company requested the Court (before the learned Single Judge) for extending the stay without adjudicating the Civil Application (for Vacating

Interim Relief) No.1 of 2024 contending it to be aggravated and flagrant contempt in violation of the aforesaid orders.

10. Thus, in nutshell, the case of the applicant is that the interim order dated 08.08.2024 passed in the captioned writ petition being Special Civil Application No.11679 of 2024 was extended at the request made by the learned advocates appearing on behalf of the respondent - Company, despite an application filed by the present applicant of vacating interim order under the provisions of Article 226 (3) of the Constitution of India.

**SUBMISSIONS BY THE LEARNED ADVOCATE MR.KHOSLA ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

11. Learned advocate Mr.Deepak Khosla, appearing for learned advocate Mr.Jaydeep M. Shukla, for the applicant has made exhaustive arguments on the approach of the learned advocates seeking extension of ad-interim order. Several remarks are also made by him against the learned Single Judges in extending the stay by not dealing with the application filed by the applicant under the provisions of Article 226 (3) of the Constitution of India.

12. It is vociferously contended by learned advocate Mr.Khosla, appearing for the applicant that after the initial order dated 08.08.2024 was passed by the learned Single Judge in the captioned writ petition granting ad-interim relief order, staying the communication dated 06.06.2024, the same was further extended and ultimately, the present applicant filed Civil Application (for Vacating Interim Relief) No.1 of 2024

in the captioned writ petition under Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India seeking vacation of the interim relief, however, the same was not decided.

13. Learned advocate Mr.Khosla has also cast aspersion on the learned Single Judges. He has submitted that in fact, when the learned Single Judge (Coram : Hon'ble Ms. Justice Sangeeta Vishen), on 02.09.2024, had rescued herself from conducting the civil application for vacating interim relief order, the ad-interim relief, which was granted by this Court vide order dated 08.08.2024 in the captioned writ petition, should not have been extended. He has also remarked on the order dated 10.09.2024, by which another learned Single Judge (Coram : Hon'ble Ms. Justice Vaibhavi D. Nanavati), has rescued herself from conducting the matter, and similar argument is advanced that ad-interim relief could not have been extended. Thereafter, unwarranted remarks are also made for the learned Single Judge (Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Nikhil S. Kariel) in passing the orders and taking *suo motu* action regarding listing of the matter.

14. While referring to the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of **High Court Bar Association, Allahabad (supra)** as well as the Full Bench decision of this Court in the case of **Maniben Virabhai (supra)**, it is submitted by learned advocate Mr.Khosla that the learned counsels should not have asked for extension of ad-interim order and since the judgment is in *rem*, by asking the Court to extend the interim order itself would amount to a civil contempt as well as criminal contempt. In order to justify his contentions, learned advocate Mr.Khosla,

has placed reliance on the transcriptions of the video recordings of the proceedings of the Courts. The same are transcribed from the proceedings, which are being live streamed on the YouTube. Such transcripts are produced by the applicant of oral augments from Page Nos.418 to 677. Thus, the transcription run into overall 259 pages. Few excerpts of the transcripts are also incorporated in the memo of the captioned application.

15. Learned advocate Mr.Khosla, has further referred to the various averments made in the civil application filed under Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India. With regard to the conduct of the learned senior counsels in seeking extension of the ad-interim relief order, he has further placed reliance on the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of Heena Nikhil Dharia vs. Kokilaben Kritikumar Nayakand, 2016 S.C.C. OnLine Bom. 9859 and it is urged that an advocate should be very fair, while conducting a proceeding before a Court. While placing reliance on the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of D.P. Chadha vs. Triyugi Narain Mishra and Ors., AIR 2001 S.C. 457, it is submitted by him that the matter should be dealt with only by the same Judge / Judicial Officer, who passed the order in question and even if he has been transferred, the matter should be forwarded to him, where he has been transferred.

16. Further aspersion has been cast by learned advocate Mr.Khosla on the learned Single Judge (Coram : Hon'ble Ms. Justice Sangeeta K. Vishen) by referring to the contents of the present application in reference to the learned senior advocate

Mr.Mihir Joshi. He has referred to the averments made in paragraph No.114, and it is alleged by him that the learned Single Judge had a private communication with the learned senior advocate for that he has produced the transcription, which was recorded on 08.08.2024 while hearing the captioned writ petition. It is thus, asserted by him that apart from the civil contempt, the learned senior advocate Mr.Joshi has also committed the criminal contempt of court.

17. By placing reliance on the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of Girish Mittal vs. Parvati V. Sundaram & Anr.(passed in Contempt Petition (C) No.928 of 2016 on 26.04.2019), it is submitted that the judgment is in general in nature and binding in *rem*. It cannot be said that a contempt petition would not be maintainable only at the behest of a party to that particular judgment and / or only against another party but it is always open for any party to seek committal of any party to trial for contempt, irrespective of their status as petitioner and / or respondent being a party to such proceeding. Similarly, reliance is also placed by learned advocate Mr.Khosla on the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of Priya Gupta vs. Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, (2013) 11 S.C.C. 404. Further reliance is also placed on the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court dated 04.10.2024 passed in Writ Petition (PIL) No.4 of 2023, in the case of Jakhariya Saleman Manek and Anr. vs. Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate Change and Ors., in which learned senior counsel Mr.Mihir Joshi had appeared. Thus, reliance is placed on the aforesaid judgment to substantiate his allegations, which are levelled against learned senior advocate Mr.Mihir

Joshi. It is, thus, contended that the subsequent happenings in the captioned writ petition will have no bearing on the initial contemptuous act committed, as referred hereinabove, and it is urged that the contempt proceedings may be initiated against the respondents by issuing a contempt notice.

18. Learned advocate Mr.Khosla has further alleged that the learned Single Judges should not have adjudicated the captioned writ petition, since the law in not entertaining the writ petition involving the disputed questions of law, is well settled. He has also referred to the provisions of Oaths Act. He has submitted that in paragraph No.43 of the application, the applicant has given names of eight learned advocates for initiating the action against them, both civil and criminal contempt of Court. He has submitted that such conduct, which has been referred hereinabove by the learned advocates, violates their oaths of office and / or constitutes professional misconduct, which amongst the private communications with the learned Judge and also constitutes criminal contempt Courts.

19. While referring to the transcriptions, it is submitted by learned advocate Mr.Khosla that the learned senior advocates as well as learned advocates on record have made reckless allegations against him. While referring to the contents of paragraph No.97 of the application, it is submitted that the learned Single Judge perhaps has some interest in taking action against the counsel for the petitioner from material outside, or not immediately visible / discernible to the general members of the public. In support of his submission, again a



transcript is produced in the said paragraph. He has further alleged that the learned Single Judge had tried to enforce a consent against the petitioner, who is respondent No.4 in Special Civil Application No.11679 of 2024, and even no consent was given in the matter that he is interpreting. He has also referred to the provisions of Sections 2(b) and 2(c) of the Contempt of Courts Act, which defines “civil contempt” as well as “criminal contempt” proceedings respectively.

**SUBMISSIONS MADE ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS:**

20. In response to the aforesaid submissions, learned senior advocate Mr.Mihir Joshi, has submitted that in fact, this application itself is not maintainable. He has referred to the civil application made by the present applicant under Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India and has submitted that the prayer clause itself suggests that there are various prayers, which are incorporated in the civil application and it cannot be said that the applicant was seeking prayer under Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India and time and again, the ad-interim relief order was extended looking to the nature of the proceedings and the prayers made in the civil application.

21. Learned senior advocate Mr.Joshi has further referred to the allegations levelled against the learned advocates as well as the learned Single Judges of this Court and has dealt with the matter of the applicant.

22. While referring to the order dated 07.10.2024 passed in the captioned writ petition by the learned Single Judge, it is submitted by learned senior advocate Mr.Joshi that in that

order, the learned Single Judge has categorically declined to vacate the ad-interim order since the impugned matter was being heard, the same has not been challenged further and has been accepted by the applicant.

23. Reference is also made by learned senior advocate Mr.Joshi to the averments made in the application, casting aspersion on the learned Single Judge. It is submitted by him that this may be the reason that the learned Single Judge has recused from the matter. Thus, it is urged that the present application may not be entertained, since no contempt is committed by the respondents.

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS MADE BY LEARNED ADVOCATE MR.KHOSLA**

24. In rejoinder to the submissions advanced by learned senior advocate Mr.Joshi, learned advocate Mr.Khosla, while referring to the affidavit-in-reply filed by the respondent-Company in the captioned Civil Application (For Vacating Interim Relief) No.1 of 2024, has contended that in the affidavit-in-reply, it is not contended by the respondents that the application filed for vacating the ad-interim relief order is not maintainable under Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India in view of the multiple prayers made therein. He has submitted that there is no need for the applicant to file various applications and an application with various prayers is always maintainable, including the prayer of vacating of ad-interim order under Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India. He has again reiterated the submissions, which are advanced by him and has submitted that the learned Single Judge only gave lip

treatment to the judgments referred by him and the learned Single Judge was required to deal with the same. It is submitted by him that judicial indiscipline is committed by the learned Single Judge, while passing the aforesaid order.

### **ANALYSIS AND OPINION**

25. As we have previously recorded, the present application is epitome of frivolity. Instead of taking a legal and valid recourse of assailing the orders passed by the learned Single Judges in passing the interim orders, the present application appears to have been filed only for the sole reason of mortifying the learned advocates appearing for the respondents and the learned Single Judges.

26. The sum and substance of the prolonged verbal calisthenic of learned advocate Mr.Khosla is that the request made by the learned advocates for extension of ad-interim order dated 08.08.2024 is contemptuous, and the learned Single Judges, before whom the matters were placed, should not have extended the ad-interim order, after filing of the civil application under the provision of Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India, and while doing so, they have committed judicial indiscipline.

27. The genesis of the present application lies in the interim order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 08.08.2024 in the captioned writ petition filed by the respondent-Company. The learned Single Judge has granted ad-interim relief by staying the communication dated 06.06.2024 till the next date of hearing. Thereafter, the matter was adjourned and was

further listed for hearing on 02.09.2024. It appears that in the meantime, the applicant has filed Civil Application (for Vacating Stay) No.1 of 2024, before the returnable date under the provisions of Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India. It is the case of the applicant that the aforesaid interim relief got vacated after completion of 15 days, as per the settled legal proposition of law, more particularly the decision of Larger Bench of this Court in the case of **Maniben Virabhai (supra)** as well as in the case of **High Court Bar Association, Allahabad (supra)**.

28. On 02.09.2024, the learned Single Judge (Coram : Hon'ble Ms. Justice Sangeeta Vishen) recused herself from conducting the matter and while recusing herself, the ad-interim relief order was further extended, till the matters are listed before another Court. Thereafter, the matters were listed before another learned Single Judge (Coram : Hon'ble Ms. Justice Vaibhavi D. Nanavati), who also recused herself and ad-interim relief order was continued. Ultimately, the civil application along with the writ petition was listed before the learned Single Judge (Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Nikhil S. Kariel) and the ad-interim relief was extended by the order dated 30.09.2024 by observing thus : -

*"Interim relief granted by this Court vide order dated 08.08.2024 shall remain extended till tomorrow i.e. 01.10.2024. The above extension is without prejudice to the rights of the respondent Nos.3 and 4 to contend that the interim relief granted vide order dated 08.08.2024, had expired long before the extension was granted by this Court.  
List on 01.10.2024."*

29. Thereafter by the orders dated 01.10.2024 and 03.10.2024, the ad-interim relief was extended and ultimately,

by the order dated 07.10.2024, the ad-interim order was extended by the learned Single Judge by observing thus : -

*“4. The request of such a declaration at this stage is not acceded to, more particularly considering that this Court has been hearing the main petition for final hearing from 30.09.2024 along with the application for vacating interim relief. Thus, if need be, appropriate adjudication on the Civil application for vacating interim relief shall also be done by this Court along with the main matter.”*

30. There are further developments in the writ petition as well as in the civil application, which we do not find necessary to incorporate in order to decide the present application, since the same would not be germane or relevant in any manner. Serious allegations / aspirations have been cast on the learned senior advocates, learned advocates as well as the learned Single Judges of this Court in the present proceedings.

31. The case of the present applicant is premised on the judgments of the Supreme Court, as referred hereinabove as well as on the decisions of the Full Bench of this Court in the case of **Maniben Virabhai (supra)** as well as in the case of **High Court Bar Association, Allahabad (supra)** and it is contended that since the aforesaid law enunciated by the Supreme Court relating to the provisions of Article 226(3) of the Constitution of India is in *rem*, it was not open for the learned senior advocates and the learned advocates appearing on behalf of the respondents to seek further extension of time, meaning thereby rendering Civil Application No.1 of 2024 for vacating the ad-interim relief, as redundant and also on the approach of the learned Single Judges in extending the interim orders.

32. By levelling aspersions, the action is sought under the Contempt of Courts Act by contending that the action of the learned senior advocates and also the extension of the ad-interim relief order would amount to the “civil contempt” under Section 2(b) of the Act and the “criminal contempt” under Section 2(c) of the Act.

33. As narrated hereinabove, the ad-interim order has been extended and now the captioned writ petition is pending for further adjudication before the learned Single Judge. The applicant has not chosen to assail the aforesaid orders before the higher forum.

34. Thus, the issue, which falls for deliberation before us is whether the aforesaid action of seeking extension of ad-interim order will amount to the Contempt of Courts Act or not, in view of the decisions of the Supreme Court rendered in the case of **High Court Bar Association, Allahabad (supra)** as well as the decision of the Full Bench of this Court in the case of **Maniben Virabhai (supra)**.

35. There cannot be any cavil on the legal precedent stemming out from the case laws cited before us but it cannot rescue the applicant from the frivolity of the application. The tenor of the application and the submissions advanced do not even remotely connect with the law of contempt so far it concerns, the respondents and the learned advocates appearing for them, but to the contrary, filing of preposterous application and making unwarranted remarks on the learned Single Judges is contumacious conduct by the applicant and learned advocate Mr.Khosla. It is apparent that, this application

has been filed for vested interest. Though, the applicant has an alternative remedy, the present application is filed by creating a peerless cause. In fact, by contending that the request made by the learned senior counsels and the learned advocates appearing for the respondents in seeking extension of ad-interim order is contemptuous, an attempt has been made to cast aspersion on the learned Single Judges of this Court in extending the ad-interim order. Learned advocate Mr.Khosla appears to be ignorant on the law of contempt or rather it appears that a deliberate attempt has been made to demean the functioning of this Court by filing this application by conflating two entirely different issues, though an alternative approach is available. The respondents along with their learned advocates are tried to be roped in for committing contempt only for the sole reason of requesting the learned Single Judges to extend the ad-interim relief, and *ad hominem* attacks are made on the learned Single Judges, who have extended the interim relief.

36. As mentioned hereinabove, there are more than 400 pages, including the memo of the application, which runs into 111 pages incorporating the transcriptions of live-streamed proceedings on the YouTube. Learned advocate Mr.Khosla has strenuously tried to impress this Court by referring to these transcripts.

37. At this stage, it becomes necessary for us to deal with the reliance placed by the applicant on the transcripts of the Court proceedings, which are live-streamed on the YouTube, for which, it would be apposite to refer to Rule 5 of the Gujarat

High Court (Live Streaming of Court Proceedings) Rules, 2021.  
(hereinafter referred to as “the Rules”) The same reads as  
under : -

**“5. Limitation and Restrictions:**

(a) *The live streaming of the court proceedings is for general information purpose only, aimed to effectuate and broaden the principles of Open Court, transparency, access to justice and larger public interest. Live streaming of the Court proceedings being done with an educative and beneficial cause, will not be sought for as of right by any of the stakeholders.*

(b) *No live commenting or live chat will be allowed on the live streaming being done of the Court proceedings. Any comments posted on uploaded videos will be moderated by the High Court and approved, if found to be appropriate, relevant and useful.*

c) xxxx.....

(d) *The High Court of Gujarat shall hold copyright over live streamed feed and videos, prohibiting any unauthorised copying of the live feed / videos. Unauthorised use/re-use, capture, editing/ re-editing, distribution/ redistribution, or creating derivative works or compiling the live streamed feed/ videos or using the same for any commercial purpose, in any form, will not be permitted. However, web-links to the entire videos as live streamed / uploaded by the High Court may be used/ embedded for any informational, educational and/ or academic purposes.*

(e) *Notwithstanding any provisions of these respondentules, no unauthorised recording / streaming of the Court proceedings by anyone is deemed to be allowed.*

(f) *The live streamed feed / videos of the court proceedings are not to be considered as part of the case or court record or for reliance by any Subordinate Court of the State in any adjudication.*

(g) *The live streamed feed / videos of the court proceedings will not be allowed to be treated as evidence of anything relating to the Court proceedings and will also not be considered admissible as such, in any Court proceedings in the High Court or Subordinate Courts.*

(h) *Requests for copy of any live streamed feed / videos will not be entertained for any purpose whatsoever.*



*(i) No content of the live streamed feed / videos or any observations made therein, will be treated as authorised/ certified / official version of anything relating to the Court proceedings. Only the orders / judgments pronounced by the respective Benches and the process / certified copies issued by the High Court Registry accordingly, will be treated as authentic and authorised.*

X x x x

*(l) Violation of any of these provisions, will entail proceedings under the provisions of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and other applicable laws”*

38. Thus, in order to substantiate the allegations against the learned Judges of this Court and against the learned advocates, the applicant has produced the transcripts running into more than 250 pages. Rule 5(a) of the aforesaid Rules clarifies that the live streaming of the Court proceedings is being done with an educative and beneficial cause, will not be sought for as of right by any of the stakeholders. Rule 5(d) declares that the High Court of Gujarat shall hold copyright over live streamed feed and videos, prohibiting any unauthorised copying of the live feed / videos. It further cautions that unauthorised use/re-use, capture, editing/ re-editing, distribution/ redistribution, or creating derivative works or compiling the live streamed feed/ videos or using the same for any commercial purpose, in any form, will not be permitted. Rule 5(e), (f) and (g) of the Rules, do not permit the same as part of Court record nor allow the live streamed videos of the court proceedings as evidence of anything and will also not be considered admissible. Rule 5(i) of the Rules mandates that ‘no content of the live streamed feed/videos or any observations made therein, will be treated as authorized/certified/official version of anything relating to the Court proceedings. Thus, the Rules prohibits any content of the live streamed videos to be used as authorized/certified/official version of “anything”

relating to the Court proceedings. It is contended by the learned advocate that the production of transcripts of the court proceedings cannot violate any of the rules, and the same can be placed reliance by the parties. However, we do not subscribe to the said submission. The aforesaid Rules extend to the transcripts also in view of the specific expression used in the Rules. The Rules prohibit “content” and “observation made in the videos”. The transcripts are derivative from the videos of court proceedings, and they will fall within the ambit of “contents” and “observations”. The Rules caution any party to use the court proceedings as an evidence, and in case, if it is done, sub-rule (I) directs initiation of the proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Thus, the use of transcription of live streaming court proceedings cannot be treated as authorized/certified/official version of anything relating to the Court proceedings and the same cannot be allowed to be treated as evidence of anything relating to the Court proceedings and will also be inadmissible, and violation of the mandate of Rules will invite proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. Thus, formulation of the transcripts by the applicant from the live streamed videos runs contrary to the mandate of Rule 5 of the aforesaid Rules, and hence, reliance placed on the unauthorized transcripts by learned advocate Mr.Khosla needs to be deprecated and highly condemned, which we do.

39. Thus, indubitably, this application is absolutely ill-conceived, frivolous and is filed with an ill-motive to demean the learned Single Judges and the learned advocates appearing for the respondents, hence it deserves to be rejected by

imposing exemplary costs. The filing of the present application is a sheer wastage of judicial time. Hence, we impose a cost of Rs.2,00,000/- on the applicant, as envisaged under Rule 21 of the Contempt of Courts (Gujarat High Court) Rules, 1984. The same shall be deposited before the Registry of this Court within a period of 02 (two) weeks from the date of pronouncement of this judgment, failing which the matter shall be listed before the Bench assigned the present roster.

40. In light of the observations made in paragraph Nos.37, 38 and 39, we are of the opinion that the videos of the Court proceedings are required to be removed from the YouTube after a specific period, however, we leave it on the discretion of Hon'ble the Chief Justice. Registry is directed to apprise Hon'ble the Chief Justice in this regard.

Sd/-  
**(A. S. SUPEHIA, J)**

Sd/-  
**(GITA GOPI, J)**

MAHESH/