

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% *Date of Decision: October 08, 2013*

+ **W.P.(CRL) 861/1997**

U.S. PANDEY PRESIDENT OF W.A.S. Petitioner
Represented by: Petitioner in person

versus

UOI & ORS Respondents
Represented by: Ms.Zubeda Begum, Advocate

CONT.CAS.(CRL) 3/1998

COURT ON ITS OWN MOTION

In Re:

UMA SHANKAR PANDEY Contemnor
Represented by: Contemnor in person

CONT.CAS.(CRL) 17/2008

UMA SHANKAR PANDEY
PRESIDENT OF W.A.S. Petitioner
Represented by: Petitioner in person

versus

UOI & ANR Respondents
Represented by: Ms.Zubeda Begum, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

1. Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey is a person who believes that he has been let down by the society and the State and therefore in desperation he turns to the legal

system for help. This Bench had the benefit of hearing him for about two hours on September 23, 2013, an hour and a half on September 25, 2013 and for two hours on September 30, 2013. His arguments were full of verbosity, clichés, stray quotations and inchoate because he shoots off at a tangent in the midst of an argument; after making submissions on other points he reverts to the point from where he took off at a tangent. Statements of facts were liberally spiced with imaginaries and concoctions.

2. We would not be wrong to record that Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey understands the general nature of the legal issues which confront him, but unfortunately these are based on illusions and fantasies and therefore he is thoroughly confused with what is relevant. The result is that he not only files confusing, lengthy and repetitive applications but also makes submissions which are a strange mix of metaphors, requiring the same to be filtered to understand what he means. In his pursuit for the quest for illusory justice, the voluminous pleadings are accompanied by newspaper reports, extract of passages from articles, decisions, legislations and international declarations on human rights. His pleadings pick on stray words and phrases, upon which he lays great emphasis. To the reader, the pleadings present a wearisome diffuse of conversation.

3. While addressing arguments, he deals with multiplicity of events, and this is the reason why he tends to repeatedly go off at a tangent. He does so in the hope and belief that in the mass of material he presents to the Judge there may be something that assists his case. But, for a Judge, this is not only inefficient and extremely frustrating, because the Judge has not only to read a large mass of irrelevant material but also hear arguments which border on perversity.

4. The voluminous record generated by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey in CrI.Writ No.861/1997 runs into 4241 pages and near about 1/10th would be

the volume of record in CrI.Contempt Case No.17/2008 initiated by him. We have not counted the number of pages constituting the record of the multiple proceedings he has initiated which are pending in the courts of Sh.S.K.Sarvaria, District & Sessions Judge, North West District Delhi; Mr.Chander Shekhar, District & Sessions Judge, North; Sh.Shailender Malik, Senior Civil Judge-cum-Rent Controller, North West District Delhi; Sh.Sumit Dass, Learned Additional Civil Judge, North West District Delhi; Sh.Sanjay Jindal, Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, North West District Delhi; Sh.Sanjeev Kumar, ASJ-I, North West District Delhi; Sh.N.K.Sharma, CBI Judge, Tis Hazari Delhi; Mr.Manish Khurana, Metropolitan Magistrate, North; and Ms.Navita Kumari, Metropolitan Magistrate, New Delhi District Delhi but we find that the number would be in the vicinity of about 20,000 pages. On September 23, 2013 after we had heard him for about two hours we had called for reports from the Judges named hereinbefore of the proceedings pending in their courts in which he was a complainant or party in civil proceedings. At the conclusion of the hearing on September 30, 2013, we had directed that record of all the proceedings pending before the learned Judges be sent to us. The reports were received from the learned Judges on September 25, 2013. The record of the proceedings was received on October 03, 2013. The same has been perused by us. The list of cases pending before the different learned Judges are as per the Schedule to the present decision, and 12 more.

5. Let us present a cacophony of what he argued before us on September 23, 2013, September 25, 2013 and September 30, 2013. We endeavour to pen profile the same, retaining the cacophony, but sans the verbosity. Referring to Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966, he proceeded to refer to Article 1 and Article 10 of the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948. But what for! He followed up by stating that his right of equality under Article 14 of the Constitution of India entitles him to appear in court. He stated that to do justice to him the State should provide him a safe accommodation in a suite in Western Court, Janpath. He said that order dated July 17, 1998 passed by Hon'ble Mr.Justice Devender Gupta and Hon'ble Mr.Justice N.G.Nandi of this Court have recognized his right and so do the orders passed on April 16, 2001 and November 17, 1999. He read out Articles 14, 16, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and made a reference to an order passed by Hon'ble Mr.Justice G.S.Singhvi (Judge, Supreme Court of India) in which observations were made on corruption pertaining to what is popularly called the '2G Scam Case'. Referring to newspaper reports pertaining to Sh.O.P.Chautala the Ex-Chief Minister of Haryana being convicted and sent to jail, he made reference to Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and made a grievance as to why Judges disregard the said provision. He said, and in respect of which he made a grievance, that on September 19, 2013 he had been assaulted by the police in-charge of the security of the Delhi High Court in front of the court room of the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the Delhi High Court and for which he had lodged FIR 50/LC. He grieved that this Court was making deliberate attempts to harass him and that the police had been cruel towards him. He referred to some order passed by the High Court of Karnataka upholding the right to complain against Judges. He stated that many Sessions Judges (names not given), were coercing him to compromise the disputes he had with other parties. He referred to a newspaper report pertaining to firing by Italian Marines, off the shore near Cochin, in which two fishermen died and said that the Supreme Court had refused to accept offer by Government of Italy to pay ₹2 crores by way of

compensation to settle the issue and said that he has the same right to enforce the penal laws pertaining to offences committed against him and that no Judge could compel him to compromise the issues raised by him. He started narrating dialogues which he had with the then Chairperson of the National Human Rights Commission, Chief Justice (Retd.) M.N.R.Venkatachaliah, and said that we could speak to him to corroborate his stand that Justice (Retd.) M.N.R.Venkatachaliah had accorded permission to him to research at the National Human Rights Commission. He referred to a statement made by Sh.Soli J.Sorabjee when he was the Attorney General of India pertaining to collapse of the criminal justice system and said that Sh.Soli J.Sorabjee was a good friend of his. He referred to L.A.University Press report of the year 1921 as to how the judicial process was being abused in the United States of America. He claimed that Sh.S.N.Dhingra, the then District & Sessions Judge Delhi, had issued notice to CBI pertaining to the death of Sh.Ravinder Kumar, Director, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. He stated that Sh.Ravinder Kumar was poisoned and that the conspiracy was hatched by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal so that he could succeed to the office of the Director of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. He said that one Sh.Sharma had also been poisoned. He said that the two were poisoned because they were his witnesses. He said that the orders passed by Sh.S.N.Dhingra had not been complied with. He followed up the submissions by saying that pursuant to some orders passed by Hon'ble Mr.Justice Badar Durrez Ahmed of this Court to provide him security he had given some papers to the then Director of Central Bureau of Investigation Sh.Ashwani Kumar. He submitted that Government Officers as also Judges are hand-in-glove with Sh.O.P.Kejariwal who became the Director of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, Teen Murti

House. He said that he has a right to ensure that CBI investigates and finds out the names of the corrupt officers in the Ministry of Home Affairs who have a nexus with corrupt bureaucrats. Referring to a newspaper report dated March 17, 2012, published in the newspaper '*Hindu*', he referred to warrants being issued in some contempt proceedings against the Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Union of India. He said that this court had issued notice to the Standing Counsel Government of NCT Delhi and alleged that thereupon the Government of Delhi, assisted by the corrupt police officers and bureaucrats, conspired to oust him from his house. He said that criminal laws are mandatory and need to be enforced. Claiming to be a very close friend of Justice (Retd.) V.R.Krishna Iyer, he argued that Justice V.R.Krishna Iyer (Retd.) had encouraged him to fight for justice. He said that sometimes rude words are used against him by Judges (whose names we can find in the applications filed by him). He said that this court should criticise the working of Judges because the Supreme Court had criticised the Gujarat High Court as per a newspaper report dated April 15, 2004. He said that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal is a history sheeter and is an accused in 285 FIRs. He said that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal was removed as a Director of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library because of a complaint against him and that there was a question raised in Parliament against Sh.O.P.Kejariwal. He referred to an article published on May 18, 1998 in '*The Tribune*' Chandigarh Edition on judicial functioning. He said that there are three kind of biases, one of which is provincial bias. Access to the Court, he said was a part of his fundamental right, which he claimed was violated because the security in-charge of this Court would issue him an entry pass only on days when above captioned petitions were listed and that too after lunch hours. He said that he suspects that the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the Delhi High

Court has passed some orders to restrict his access to this Court and for which he wanted a direction to be issued to the Hon'ble Chief Justice to permit him access to his Lordship's Secretariat to enable him to inspect the record. He claimed to have inspected the record of the court presided over by Sh.N.K.Sharma CBI Judge, and therefrom drew sustenance to the argument of his entitlement to inspect the record of the Secretariat of the Chief Justice of this Court. He said that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal has corrupted police officers. He said that he was a Senior Research Associate and was senior to Sh.O.P.Kejariwal. That the topic of his Ph.D. was '*Impact of British Colonialism on Indian Political Thought with Reference to Dadabhai Naoroji*'; and the grievance was that the research material collected by him on said topic was stolen by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal to publish a book and additionally some articles; the details of which he could not remember because his record was stolen. He said that he had collected papers and research material for his thesis from the National Archives of India and from the Teen Murti House Library where he had worked in the year 1992 and that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal, along with other unknown persons, committed dacoity and stole the research material. He said that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal was illegally appointed as a Director of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. He said that he was enrolled as a Ph.D. Scholar at Allahabad University in the year 1984 and one Prof.K.C.Joshi was his guide. He said that his father died in the year 1995. He said that he started doing serious research only in the year 1988, when grants were sanctioned to him by U.G.C. and National Council for Historical Research. He said that when he came to Delhi in the year 1988 he stayed in the dormitory on the 4th floor in Bihar Bhawan at Kautaliya Marg and after a few years he took a room on rent at Flat No.204, South Avenue, allotted to one Dr.R.K.Kusumaria, a Member of Parliament

from Madhya Pradesh, from which room he was evicted in a year which he did not remember. Thereafter he resided at a place which he did not remember exactly but was somewhere along the road from Teen Murti House to Race Course. He said that he had sent a telegram to the District Magistrate Allahabad of divine knowledge bestowed upon him that one lakh gold mohars were hidden under the earth at a place in Allahabad and this information leaked. Hoping to find proof of the exact location of the place in Allahabad where the gold mohars were lying hidden, under the belief that the same would probably be on a map or a writing on a piece of paper, thieves broke into the room where he was staying and threw out his belongings. He met the Director or may be the Deputy Director of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library who was kind enough to permit him to stay in a room and keep his belongings next to the room of Sh.Madhusudan Bhangar, the caretaker of the Teen Murti Complex. He kept his belongings at a room in the Teen Murti complex. A dacoity took place and his intellectual properties, meaning the research material collected by him, were stolen by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal and his goons to illegally publish a book using his stolen intellectual properties. He made a grievance of a Civil Court permitting a decree of eviction passed against him to be executed by the landlord; complaining that the courts were overlooking serious issues concerning corruption in society and were busy with mundane issues like solving inter-personal disputes and in particular the eviction petition filed by his landlord. Becoming extremely emotional during arguments he referred to the events of May, 2013. (What were they!) He alleged that Dr.Manmohan Singh, the Prime Minister of India, was a Punjabi terrorist and has destroyed his life. He claimed that at the instance of the Prime Minister of India, in connivance with the officers of Delhi Police, a learned

Judge in Rohini Court District Complex has illegally executed an eviction decree obtained by his landlord and his landlady, whom he calls Sindhi gangsters (probably for the reason they are from Sindh). He stated that after illegally evicting him from the house the landlord has demolished the roof of the house. He stated that left on the street to fend for himself, opposite the house from where he has been evicted, as a part of a global conspiracy, one night accompanied by police officers Dr.Manmohan Singh came and removed the street light under which he used to write the petitions and applications which he files in the courts. He wanted a case of dacoity to be registered against the Prime Minister of India and prayed to us that contempt action be initiated against the Prime Minister of India, whom he repeatedly labels as corrupt, as also against the police officers who brought the Prime Minister in a jeep and assisted him in removing the street light. Aforesaid is a brief summary of the inchoate arguments he had advanced on 23rd and 25th September, 2013. On September 30, 2013, he commenced his arguments by stating that Professor Ravinder Kumar was poisoned in a function organized by Ms.Promila Thapar because Professor Ravinder Kumar was appointed as a mediator between him and Sh.O.P.Kejariwal. He said that he had studied in the National Archives of India to collect research material in the year 1991-92 and that a book was published by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal with reference to his i.e. O.P.Kejariwal's Ph.D. thesis, but after using his i.e. Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey's, intellectual properties. Meaning thereby, the research material gathered by him which was stolen by the goons set on him by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal was used. He said that the eviction decree passed against him had been challenged by him in the court of Sh.S.K.Sarvaria against orders passed by Mr.Sumit Dass, Senior Civil Judge-cum-Rent Controller but the learned Rent Controller had executed the decree in a pre-planned

conspiracy with corrupt police officers and the Prime Minister of India. Contrary to his claim made while arguing on 23rd and 25th September, 2013, that he was living on the street the light whereof was stolen by the Prime Minister of India to prevent him from petitioning the courts, arguing on September 30, 2013, he said that on being evicted from the 3rd floor of house No.F-3/46, Sector-15, Rohini he was forced to stay with his brother, Mr.Ved Vyas Pandey. He said that he wanted the State to provide him a house because it was the obligation of the State to do so because the accommodation with his brother was inadequate. When we asked him the address where his brother resided, he said that he cannot disclose the same because the corrupt police on directions of the corrupt Prime Minister of India, who was a Punjabi terrorist, would trouble his brother. He argued that the Punjabi terrorists have captured the Delhi Police because all Commissioners of Police, including the present incumbent, were Punjabis. He said that the District & Sessions Judge, North Delhi District was rude to his brother Sh.Ved Vyas Pandey who was a witness to the dacoity which took place when his landlord evicted him. He said that when the corrupt police evicted him from the tenanted premises owned by the landlord Sh.Sanjay Darira his property was stolen. He said that his goods could not be entrusted on superdari to Sh.Sanjay Darira. He said that when the dacoity was on he had called his brother who was thus a witness.

6. After hearing him patiently at the post-lunch sessions spread over three days, as the hearing proceeded on September 30, 2013, we asked him as to what proof he had of having researched as per his claim and did he have any proof of the conspiracy hatched against him and what was the role played by the conspirators. At that question he got agitated and said that since everything was stolen what proof could he furnish. He said that even

today while he was sitting outside this court preparing for his case, when the court orderly attached to this Court came to inform him that the matter had been called for hearing, as he rose, somebody took away his papers in a jiffy. Shifting towards his right to demonstrate to us as to how he moved when the court orderly attached to this Court told him that his case had been called out, he repositioned himself and said that the hidden forces unleashed on him by the corrupt Prime Minister of India had managed to remove some papers from his file which he had brought in the court. He got very agitated. We asked him how he was sustaining himself in Delhi for so long. He said that initially he was receiving a stipend while pursuing his Ph.D. and that thereafter pertaining to some project of British Historiography of India in the 19th Century he was given grants for doing research and that he had also been awarded a fellowship by Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund as also from Indian Council of Historical Research. When asked what was the monthly stipend he said that it varied between ₹1,500 to ₹2,000 per month. He hastened to add that this was a ploy to entrap him to misuse his intellectual properties because the research material was supplied by him to the sponsoring body, which in turn published articles. He refused to give an answer of what he was doing after 1997 and said that he understood psychology and the reason why the Court was quizzing him so. He said that he feared that this Court would dispose of all his applications and petitions and warned the court that no orders should be passed except in CrI.M.No.9012/2013. He specifically told us that we should not call for and look into the record of the proceedings pending before Judges in the District Judiciary. He said that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal had been using his research material to publish articles in newspapers; but he could give no proof because thieves and gangsters have, with impunity, plundered his

intellectual properties. He reiterated that he is a scholar of international repute and that whatever he says is evidenced under Section 45 of the Indian Evidence Act. Thus no proof is required. He concluded by informing us that on September 25, 2013 he had filed an application, which we find is at page No.4209 of the record of the writ petition, as per which he wants this Court to take on record an amended memo of parties, in which, apart from 62 respondents which he claims are respondents in the writ petition, 58 more are sought to be impleaded as respondents, and some as diverse as :

- “a. Computer Section Officers 1-B, Ground Floor
Delhi High Court, New Delhi*
- b. Commissioner of UNHRC, Geneva, Switzerland*
- c. Arvind Kejariwal – Public Servant (GOI)
Through the Commissioner of Police*
- d. Manish Sisodia Kabir – NGO
Through the Commissioner of Police*
- e. Anil/Mukesh Ambani
Reliance Group Bombay”*

7. He concluded on the note that under no circumstances should this Court dispose of the writ petition filed by him or any application filed by him in the writ petition, much less any proceeding initiated by him before any Judge in a court subordinate to this court. He said that at present he was only enforcing his right to a residence to be provided to him by the State; which had to be either suite No.7 or suite No.8 at Western Court, Janpath. He warned that if provoked he could burn the courts or commit suicide.

8. We now proceed to pen profile the litigious journey covered in W.P.(Crl.) No. 861/1997 filed by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey in this Court.

9. In the writ petition, he pleads that he was a scholar of International Law and was an International lawyer appearing in important matters in courts in India, World Court and United Nations. He claims to be the President of the World Association of Scholars. He pleads that he seeks a mandamus to compel public authorities to perform their duties and was aggrieved by the deprivation of his intellectual properties in the prime of his life and being subjected to a systematic oppression and mental torture. His intellectual assets were being misused. He pleads that Sh.Indrajit Gupta, the Home Minister was a guilty communist conspirator who interfered to protect O.P.Kejariwal with respect to a complaint made by him on August 30, 1997. He pleads that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal is a Government servant and is a cheat and a thug. He pleads that Sh.S.Jaipal Reddy, the Union Minister of Information and Broadcasting was shielding Sh.O.P.Kejariwal and thus both were gang men. He pleads that both Ministers are law-breakers and conspirators. He pleads that the Union Home Minister has been abetting and causing damage to him by perpetuating misappropriation of his intellectual properties. He claims that he was being harassed, assaulted, humiliated, insulted and defamed by the gangsters of the Home Ministry. He pleads that the Union Home Minister was unauthorizedly occupying suites No.6 and 7 in the Western Court Building Complex on Janpath. He pleads that non-enforcement of his fundamental rights negate the rule of law and his human rights as per the U.N.Universal Declaration dated December 10, 1948.

10. He seeks the relief that the Union Home Minister be compelled to perform his public duties by directing the Commissioner of Police New Delhi to register FIRs on complaints made by him. He prays that the Home Minister and Sh.O.P.Kejariwal as also Sh.Jaipal Reddy, all of whom have been impleaded as respondents, should be arrested. He prays that the Union

Home Minister should be evicted from the suites occupied by him at Western Court Janpath and that security be provided to him and an accommodation at Western Court be provided to him till cases filed by him in India and at United Nations are over. He seeks damages in sum of ₹10 crores. He also prays that Jain Commission of Inquiry Report (pertaining to the death of Sh.Rajeev Gandhi, Late Prime Minister of India) be not tabled till his cases are decided.

11. In the caption of the writ petitions it is stated:

‘Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the restoration of intellectual properties of international importance including evidences regarding assassination of Late Sh.Rajeev Gandhi in international criminal conspiracy, stay of the final Jain Commission Reports regarding assassination and fundamental rights of the petitioner – Articles 14, 16, 19, 21.’

12. Listed for the first time in Court along with CrI.M.No.6588/1997, in which he pleads that he was assaulted on December 05, 1997 by gangsters set loose by the respondents in the writ petition i.e. O.P.Kejariwal, Indrajit Gupta and S.Jaipal Reddy, he prays for compensation to be paid in sum of ₹10 crores. The writ petition and the miscellaneous application were listed before a Division Bench on December 10, 1997 and were simply adjourned for February 19, 1998.

13. Thereafter commences the long journey lasting till today and during which, Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey has filed as many as 97 civil miscellaneous applications in the criminal contempt petition.

14. Within five days of the order dated December 10, 1997 being passed, he filed CrI.M.No.6494/1997, on December 15, 1997 praying that his case be transferred to another Bench, which application was dismissed on December 16, 1997. On January 08, 1998, he filed RA No.4/1998 seeking

review of the order dated December 15, 1997, which was dismissed on January 16, 1998. He pursued the matter further on the same day i.e. January 16, 1998, by filing CrI.M.No.261A/1998, seeking an apology from the Registrar of this Court and compensation in sum of ₹10 lakhs; pleading that the Registrar of this Court and other officers have entered into a criminal conspiracy to deny him physical access to the premises of Jawahar Lal Nehru Memorial Fund (probably meaning Library). The application was dismissed on January 19, 1998; and he sought review of the said order by filing RA No.5/1998 on January 21, 1998, making confusing pleadings. The application was dismissed on January 22, 1998. He thereafter filed CrI.M.No.497/1998 on January 27, 1998, praying that directions be issued for renewal of his membership of the Nehru Memorial Library at Teen Murti, which was dismissed on January 28, 1998 observing that the prayer was beyond the scope of the writ petition filed. He thereafter filed CrI.M.No.939/1998 seeking review of the order dated January 28, 1997, in which he made derogatory remarks against the Judges who had dealt with the writ petition filed by him as also the miscellaneous applications filed.

15. Vide order dated February 19, 1998, this Court took cognizance of the derogatory language used in CrI.M.No.939/1998 and formed a prima facie opinion that the same amounted to a contempt of this Court and thus a notice was framed and served upon the petitioner to show cause as to why proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act be not initiated against him. It was directed that the Registry would put the notice in a separate file, registering a contempt proceedings against Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey on the Courts own motion. Hearing of Criminal Writ 861/1997 and pending applications was deferred indefinitely, recording that the same would be taken up for hearing after the fate of the contempt proceedings initiated

against him concluded. Thus, CrI.M.No.939/1998 is still pending adjudication.

16. Thereafter, the writ petition never proceeded ahead for the reason, Criminal Contempt No.3/1998 on the Courts own motion commenced its journey against Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey and till date is meandering its way with leisure.

17. We would not be wrong if we would say that Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey has made a nuisance of himself and has bombarded this Court with applications after applications, sometimes in the contempt proceedings and mostly in the criminal writ petition filed by him.

18. Listing out further applications filed by him, on the onward march of the history of the proceedings pertaining to the criminal writ petition filed by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey, hearing whereof was indefinitely adjourned on February 18, 1998, we find that on the same day he filed CrI.M.No.942/1998, in which he prayed that the SHO of P.S.Chankaya Puri be directed to register FIRs on all complaints made by him. The said application is pending.

19. On March 26, 1998 he filed CrI.M.No.1800/1998, which is still pending, in which he prayed that the matter may be referred to a Constitution Bench comprising 7 Judges. On May 23, 1998 he filed CrI.M.No.3219/1998 praying that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal be suspended and appointment of Sh.Pramod Mahajan be stayed. The application awaits adjudication. On July 16, 1998 he filed CrI.M.No.4094/1998 praying for review of the order dated May 25, 1998 which was dismissed on July 17, 1998. He followed it up by filing CrI.M.No.5346/1998 on September 02, 1998 and CrI.M.No.5735/1998 on September 23, 1998, and pithily stated, he claimed that a gang of four people set on him by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal had

threatened him on September 17, 1998 between 8:30 PM and 9:00 PM and thus he should be provided with security. He has pleaded that he was not being permitted to make oral mention in Court. He pleads that prejudice is caused to him due to delay in registering criminal cases against Sh.O.P.Kejariwal. The applications were dismissed on October 22, 1998, but before that, on October 06, 1998 he filed CrI.M.No.5873/1998 praying that all reliefs prayed for in the writ petition should be allowed. In the pleadings of the application he makes reference to Sh.O.P.Kejariwal stealing his intellectual properties and the SHO of the concerned police station not registering an FIR pertaining to the offence of dacoity. He refers to one Prof.S.M.Sakhdar of Jawahar Lal Nehru University and complains against him of trying to pressurize him to compromise the matter. He pleads that 'Bania' criminals have been threatening and terrorizing him. The application was dismissed. In between he has also filed CrI.M.No.5945/1998, once again seeking that by way of interim relief all prayers sought in the writ petition be allowed; which application was also dismissed on October 22, 1998. He has thereafter filed CrI.M.No.6003/1998 praying that the record of National Human Rights Commission be summoned, which was dismissed on October 22, 1998. In this application, he claims that Ms.Sushma Swaraj, the then Minister for Information and Broadcasting ran away to become the Chief Minister of Delhi because she was apprehending action against her by the Delhi High Court. He also pleads that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal stole literature titled '*God's Will and Gods and Goddesses*'. This application has also been dismissed. He then filed CrI.M.No.6637/1998 on November 07, 1998 seeking legal aid in the form of cash assistance which was dismissed on November 16, 1998 holding that legal aid in the form of cash assistance could not be granted.

20. He thereafter filed CrI.M.No.7184/1998, praying that order dated July 17, 1998 (a non-existing order) be implemented. In the pleadings he claims that there exists some nexus between India and the United Kingdoms and that officers of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry have been cheating and defrauding him. That one Ms.Sudha Gupta was murdered due to evasive attitude of the police. He states that he was entitled to publish his research papers and thus urgently required orders that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal should return his intellectual properties. The said application was dismissed on December 01, 1998. At the dawn of the next year, he filed CrI.M.No.585/1999 praying that arrest warrants be issued against Sh.O.P.Kejariwal. In this application, he pleads that a criminal gang has been active in India in connivance with Oxford University Press, New York Press and Ministry of Information and Broadcasting to deprive him of his intellectual properties by illegally publishing them in India and abroad. He pleads that a T.V. serial '*Sarbashaktiman*' was produced by distorting ideas originally conceived of by him in the course of his autobiographical writings. He pleads that Sh.Soli J.Sorabjee the then Attorney General of India was a British Spy and was acting against the interest of the country. He has annexed with the application an article referring to Sh.Soli J.Sorabjee suing the publication '*Asian Age*' for defamation. Issuing a warning to him to desist from filing such applications, the same was dismissed on January 27, 1998.

21. We have briefly referred to the contents of the pleadings of the 17 applications filed by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey in the formative period of the litigation covering one year to illustratively note facts which would be relevant for our discussion to follow. But being of the opinion that such pen profiling, howsoever brief it may be, by noting each and every application

filed subsequently; the number whereof is 76 remaining applications, would consume unnecessary time of the reader of our opinion, we are self-advisingly fast tracking the recording of the pleadings constituting various applications filed by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey by clubbing the co-related pleadings in the applications i.e. listing the applications not with reference to the serial number of the filing but with reference to the commonality of the subject matter of the pleadings and breaking the period into two i.e. upto the year 2004 and the period thereafter.

22. In CrI.M.No.591/1999 he claims that the Government obstructed him when he attempted to bring to the notice of Mr.Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of United Nations his grievances. He claims to be a witness to the murder of Sh.Rajiv Gandhi and seeks a prohibition of criminal proceedings to be initiated against him. Claiming to be a scholar he wants the Court to declare that any statement made by him be treated as evidence under Section 45 of the Evidence Act. He pleads that the State is preventing him from completing his Ph.D. thesis on the subject '*Impact of British Colonialism on Indian Political Thought Process with Reference to Dadabhai Naoroji*'. He pleads that he has executed a Will as per which his last rites should be performed at the U.N.Headquarters and makes a grievance of the Will being looted at a dacoity. As per CrI.M.No.3754/2005 he alleges that Kofi Annan has breached a promise made in India to stop human right violations in India and prays that Kofi Annan be summoned. In CrI.M.No.1286/1999 he pleads that his academic life has been ruined because of loss of accommodation. He pleads that he is a Brahmin conducting '*Universal Dharmashashtric Interrogatories*' as a part of his fundamental rights and that five of his friends have been crushed to death in Delhi. He annexes a newspaper report along with the application highlighting corruption. Vide

CrI.M.No.1543/1999, 1800/1999, 2214/1999, 4228/1999, 4695/1999, 7640/1999, 9586/1999, 11374/1999, 1761/2000, 1762/2000, 46/2001, 53/2001, 612/2001 and 5642/2004, he inter-alia, names Sh.Inder Kumar Gujral, Ms.Sonia Gandhi, Ms.Rabri Devi, Sh.Lalu Prasad Yadav, Sh.Pramod Mahajan, Sh.L.K.Advani, Sh.Arun Jaitley, Sh.S.Jaipal Reddy, Sh.K.Natwar Singh, Sh.Madan Lal Khurana, Ms.Uma Bharti and Dr.Shankar Dayal Sharma (the Ex-President of India) all of whom were known public figures or Chief Ministers, Ministers as also the President of India at the relevant period of time when the applications were filed. He also names in these applications various police officers in Delhi and one judicial officer.

23. Sieving his pleadings in the applications which are repetitive, incoherent and prolix, the concentrate of the concoction is that the public figures and politicians were corrupt and were shielding the corrupt police officers; all the public figures and politicians named, as also the police officers were a part of a global conspiracy hatched by the Governments of USA, U.K., France, Pakistan, Nepal and India to ensure that his intellectual properties were misused. He latches on to newspaper reports reporting adversely or critically on the functioning of these high public office holders such as the Prime Ministers and Union Cabinet Ministers. He has been picking on each and every person who functioned as the Commissioner as also the Joint Commissioner of Police during this period covering 1999-2004 and has highlighted the failed and blotched up investigations by the police pertaining to the Jesicca Lal murder case. The name of O.P.Kejariwal looms large at the backdrop of most of these applications.

24. In the period post 2005 till today, we find that Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey has filed nearly 50 applications in which the shift of the

blameworthiness is on the shoulders of Sh.Shiv Raj Patil, who held offices as Union Minister for Home, Sh.Arjun Singh, the Union Minister for Human Resource Development, Sh.P.Chidambaram, the Union Minister for Finance for some period and thereafter the Union Minister for Home Affairs and the current Prime Minister of India, Dr.Manmohan Singh. During this period we find that the tone and tenor of the pleadings has turned acerbic. Of course, Sh.O.P.Kejariwal continues to loom large at the backdrop. Highlighting newspaper reports pertaining to corruption, be it match fixing scandals, sale of spectrum, Sh.Lalu Prasad Yadav (Chief Minister of Bihar) being an accused in the alleged fodder scandal, he pleads that as a part of the global conspiracy alleged by him, these people have managed to gain political power using his intellectual properties to destroy India. Wherever there is a reference to the name of the current Prime Minister of India, Dr.Manmohan Singh, he highlights the religion of the Prime Minister to allege that he is a Punjabi terrorist who has managed to reach the highest executive public position in India.

25. Most critical is the fact that since July 2013 his attention seems to have shifted to embrace even Arvind Kejariwal who has founded a political party called Am Admi Party and a colleague of his named Manish Sisodia, and as noted above in a amended memo of parties filed by him he has sought to implead said two persons apart from 56 others as further respondents.

26. It would be relevant to highlight at this stage that before the court, grievances of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey surfaced in late 1997, by which time the Janta Dal Government headed by Sh.H.D.Deve Gowda had demitted office on April 21, 1997 and the Government headed by Sh.I.K.Gujral was in place from April 21, 1997 and lasted till March 19, 1998. The Union Minister for Home Affairs was Sh.Indrajit Gupta, a known public figure and

a leading member of the Communist Party of India. Sh.S.Jaipal Reddy was the Minister in-charge of Information and Broadcasting. Sh.O.P.Kejariwal had taken over as the Director of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library in the year 1997 after Prof.Ravinder Kumar's term as Director came to an end in said year. Sh.O.P.Kejariwal had functioned before that as the Director General of Doordarshan under the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The BJP government under the Prime Ministership of Sh.Atal Bihari Bajpayee lasted from March 19, 1998 till May 22, 2004 and thereafter till date the Congress led government under the Prime Ministership of Dr.Manmohan Singh has continued since May 22, 2004.

27. From the pleadings and the arguments of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey we find that when the writ petition was filed in late 1997 the persons targeted were the then Union Minister for Home Affairs and the Union Minister for Information and Broadcasting. Persons named thereafter between the years 1998 and 2004 are Ms.Sushma Swaraj, Sh.L.K.Advani, Sh.Madan Lal Khurana, Ms.Uma Bharti, Sh.Arun Jaitley, Sh.Pramod Mahajan. Thereafter the applications filed in the year 2005 onwards we find the focus of accusations shifting to Sh.Lalu Prasad Yadav, Sh.Shiv Raj Patil, Sh.P.Chidambaram, Ms.Sonia Gandhi, Sh.Pranab Mukherjee and Dr.Manmohan Singh when the Congress led government was formed in the Centre on May 22, 2004, all of whom except Ms.Sonia Gandhi were either the Prime Minister or Ministers in the Union Cabinet and Ms.Sonia Gandhi was the President of the Congress party.

28. From the inchoate submissions made by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey, which we have noted in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 above, and from his pleadings in the writ petition as also the various applications filed, we find that the centre point of his grievances is that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal stole his intellectual

properties i.e. research material gathered by him in the course of his research for the dissertation '*Impact of British Colonialism on Indian Political Thought with Reference to Dadabhai Naoroji*'. He claims that he was enrolled as a scholar for Ph.D. with Allahabad University in the year 1984, but claims to have come to Delhi to gather research material available in the National Archives and Nehru Memorial Library and Museum at Teen Murti House at Delhi in the year 1988 and claims that he firstly resided in a dormitory on the fourth floor of Bihar Bhawan at Kautilya Marg for some years and took on rent a room in Flat No.204, South Avenue from a Member of Parliament when he had to leave Bihar Bhawan. He claims to have shifted to a place not known to him where a theft took place because somebody learnt that he had knowledge of a treasure in the form of 1 lakh gold mohars lying hidden somewhere in Allahabad and thus the object of the theft was to find the paper on which particulars of the place were noted by him. He claims that he was accessing Nehru Memorial Library for research purposes and that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal, who had become a Director of the library in the year 1997, taking pity on him, had allowed him to keep his belongings, which included the research material gathered by him in a room adjoining the room of the security in-charge and that one night Sh.O.P.Kerjiwal and his gangsters committed dacoity when his research papers were taken away. His grievance is that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal has used the research material gathered by him in publishing a book, which we find was published in the year 1998 by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal and bears the title: '***THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL and the Discovery of India's Past 1784-1838***'.

29. The preface written by the author to the book as also the foreword thereto by Prof.A.L.Basham, a professor in History, would evidence that

Dr.O.P.Kejariwal's Ph.D. dissertation which he had submitted somewhere between the year 1970-1975 was read by Prof.A.L.Basham who strongly recommended it to be published, and inspired by the words of Prof.A.L.Basham, Dr.O.P.Kejariwal updated his thesis and published the book in the year 1988.

30. We have troubled ourselves to read the book and for which we express our gratitude to him, for but for him we would not have read the book. Bengal during the period 1784-1838 from the backdrop. As is known to all, the Asiatic Society of Bengal was founded in the year 1784 by Sir William Jones. The society is known for its pioneering work in laying the foundations of Indological Studies. Collecting and studying manuscripts, coins, inscriptions and monuments, the members of the society laid bare the broad outlines of ancient Indian History and re-discovered the great classics of Sanskrit literature and its epics such as Kalidasa's *Sakuntala* and the *Rig Veda*. Writings on the forgotten umpires of Ashoka and Maurya were recorded by the society, initially by Sir William Jones thereafter by his successors H.T.Colebrooke, H.H.Wilson and James Prinsep.

31. The author, Dr.O.P.Kejariwal, in his book, has examined the evidence supporting the widely-held view that British Studies on India were motivated largely by political reasons – by the need for knowledge to understand how the Britishers should rule in India.

32. We do not know the contents of the stated research material gathered by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey, if indeed he did gather some, but we have no reasons to disbelieve that he gathered none. The only clue we have is with reference to the topic of his research as he tells us: '*Impact of British Colonialism on Indian Political Thought Process with Reference to Dadabhai Naoroji*'.

33. Having read the book authored by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal which has been published by Oxford University Press, we find no reference to any research material impacting British Colonialism Policy except the material which would suggest that British studies on India were motivated largely by political reasons – the need for knowledge and understanding of the ruled by the ruler. The only thing we could find of relevance, having some connection with the possible research material gathered by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey, is in the conclusions drawn by the author, where the author opines that the apathy of the Government towards institutes of oriental learning was not directed towards the Bengali society evidenced by the fact that the Royal Asiatic Society in England shared the same fate; and the possible connectivity could be an attempt to crush nationalism and in that context a connection with, how colonization of India by the British impacted the political history of India.

34. As regards Dadabhai Naoroji, we find that he was the author of a classic book : '*Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*' published in the year 1867 in which he developed the '*Drain Theory*' according to which the British carried away India's wealth by taxing the people in a way which promoted British trade and manufacture of cloth and in return impoverishing the Indian people. His thesis, on which he was gathering research material, would therefore possibly have a connection with the writing of Dadabhai Naoroji but the said writing of Dadabhai Naoroji would have no concern or connection with the topic on which Sh.O.P.Kejariwal has authored a book.

35. Not only do we find an impossibility of the use of any research material collected by him in the book authored by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal; not upon appraisal of the contents and the subject matter of the book, but from the fact that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal published his book in the year 1988. Thus we

have a conclusive fact, incapable of being rebutted, that whatever research material was used by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal for writing the book had been accessed by him lastly till the year 1988, and not thereafter. It is in this context that it assumes importance that as per him he came to Delhi for research work for the first time in the year 1988 and stayed in a dormitory on the fourth floor of Bihar Bhawan and after a few years he rented room at Flat No.204, South Avenue, New Delhi without any problem. He does not tell us the year when he was evicted from the flat, but gives traces when he states that the first time he was assaulted and theft of some property of his took place in the year 1994. But what is relevant is his claim of his intellectual properties being stolen in the year 1997, and these intellectual properties are his research material. His tirade against Sh.O.P.Kejariwal commences in the year 1997.

36. His inchoate pleadings and oral submissions throw light on a very important fact. As per him, Sh.O.P.Kejariwal permitted him to occupy a room and keep his belongings in Teen Murti Complex from where he claims he was thrown out after being assaulted and claims that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal stole his research material. If we believe him that he was a research scholar visiting Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, it is apparent that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal, who was the then Director of Nehru Memorial Museum and Library in the year 1997 had obviously taken pity on him and to help him out had permitted him to keep his belongings temporarily at an outhouse quarter within the precincts of Teen Murti Complex till when he could find alternative accommodation, which probably he could not find and Sh.O.P.Kejariwal could obviously not allow him to reside endlessly within the precincts of Teen Murti Complex and thus got him evicted. It is this which has triggered of the unfortunate self-destructive journey undertaken

by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey. In any case, we highlight that O.P.Kejariwal, having published his book in the year 1988, could under no circumstances have used any research material of the petitioner and thus it is crystal clear that everything pleaded and argued by the petitioner is a figment of his imagination.

37. We have thus two reasons to hold that everything pleaded and spoken of by him is a figment of his imagination. The first is our reading of the book authored by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal and our opinion thereon, which somebody may criticise as the subjective opinion of Judges, but we would caution the critic that if the charge is of theft of research material gathered by a researcher the contents of the allegedly stolen publication and the possible contents of the material gathered with reference to the topic of research, it would be a legitimate exercise to theoretically discuss the content of the possible material of the two topics. The second is that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal published his book in the year 1988.

38. To sample a flavour of how he intends to prove the hundreds of complaints filed by him which are pending before different learned Metropolitan Magistrates in Delhi, we may refer to Complaint Case No.9460/1 dated January 20, 2006 pending before the Court of Ms.Navita Kumari Bagha. The complaint is actually filed in the year 2003 and it is apparent that the re-numbered complaint with the date is on account of the fact that the matter was transferred to a new court. In Delhi, if a new court is created and matters are received by it on transfer, a new number is assigned. The complaint is the usual theory of alleging O.P.Kejariwal troubling him. It makes a reference to Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey being injured on April 10, 2003. He refers to acts of dacoity. He states that he has spoken to Mr.Yashwant Sinha, the Union External Affairs Minister. He

makes a grievance that Sh.Jaswant Singh is favouring the accused. We find that in said complaint Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey's statement was first recorded on October 26, 2010 followed by a further statement recorded on November 30, 2010, followed by further statement recorded on March 26, 2011. Thereafter on June 30, 2011, May 15, 2012, August 01, 2012, February 26, 2013 and thereafter on June 04, 2013. The statements run into 120 pages. All and sundry things are spoken of. The statement dated June 26, 2011 speaks of a DNA test conducted by a laboratory in Hyderabad on the samples obtained by the Delhi High Court from Sh.N.D.Tiwari. He speaks about autobiographical writings relating to Pt.Madan Mohan Malviya and claims that they have been used by the Delhi High Court and the Supreme Court of India under Section 44 of the Evidence Act. To get a flavour of what he speaks, we reproduce his statement recorded on June 04, 2013. He has stated on oath as under :-

“Statement of Sh.Uma Shanker Pandey recalled for further examination-in-chief.

ON S.A.

I Uma Shakar Pandey, President of W.A.S. R/o NMML, TMH, New Delhi give my statements and evidence in continuation of evidence and statements of mine recorded on 26.02.2013 in this Hon'ble Court. Today I have filed one Crl.Misc.Application U/Sec. 7,13,17,28 of P.C.Act, 1988 also U/Sec.420, 467,468, 469,307, 153-A, 32, 34, 191, 192, 107, 108, 109, 499, 500 & Others IPC detailed in the FIR dated 10/11.05.2013, DD No.257-LC to SHO P.S. Tilak Marg lodged by me against the accused who had further committed and abetted the offences detailed. In this application, I have adduced one affidavit filing NO.51393/2013 dated 03.06.2013 filed by me in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The adduced FIR is against corporate-terrorists Anil Aggarwal, Arun Aggarwal and their associates who had committed frauds, deceits, cheating in connivance of some state

terrorists/accused and multi-national agents from abroad. I had mentioned before Hon'ble Delhi High Court Bench (DB) presided over by Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.D.Ahmed in Court No.3, in my Crl.Writ No.861/1997 & Ors connected, against these offenders detailed above. The purpose of mentioning done and FIR lodged is to bring to the notice of Hon'ble Supreme Court and other Courts concerned where criminal trials have been going on against these accused. Some evidence and witnesses have also been recorded against them from time to time. Since I was the original author of Vedantic resources and the same was deprived, smuggled out, forged and mis-used by offenders of India and abroad including U.K. accused involved in many FIRs and criminal complaints pending before this Hon'ble Court. A vendantic Company was fraudulently established in UK by mis-use of my intellectual properties and manuscripts deprived. The foundation of this company was illegal, unconstitutional and conspiratorial and deceitful in UK. Any business deal based upon this tainted and illegal foundation shall be illegal. The accused/British had conspiratorially fixed their agent Anil Aggarwal in Mumbai to extend their illegal business. Cairn-Vedanta-deal of \$ 8.48 billion between Cairn and Anil Aggarwal-accused was obtained by fraud, with malafide intentions to rationalize illegalities, irrationalities and improprieties committed by these offenders from India to U.K. and it was obtained in international criminal conspiracy. Arun Kumar Aggarwal tainted agent of Anil Aggarwal-accused filed a PIL in style of Noora Kusti to favour Anil Aggarwal. Any order by such gross mis-leading and mis-guiding detailed in the FIR, I had mentioned that it shall be a obiter dicta, and have no force of final judgment. Such orders are nullities in law by Supreme Court judgments, wholly in effectual and in operative. The obiter-dicta mentioned in FIR was obtained in violation of full bench order of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India presided over by former CJ J.S.Verma on 07.05.1997 and also in prima facie violation of principles of natural justice fully detailed in the FIR. In this application on the last page No.15, the Central Govt. directions to all the States for registration of the FIRs shall be applicable to all the FIRs lodged by me so far during last two decades. It was evident in Indian Express on 03.06.2013.

The statements and evidence of mine contained in the affidavit dated 04.05.2013 filed on 06.05.2013 in Supreme Court of India,

filing No.45758/2013 shall be part and parcel of my statements and evidence. On 31.05.2013 I was heard in one Crl.M.P.No.86049/13 fixed in the Hon'ble Delhi High Court, Court No.6 against the accused/respondents including Arvind Kejriwal and his associates against whom my evidence and statements were recorded in part. I had brought 7 seminal questions of law detailed on pages 6,7,8 and 9 of this application heard on 31.05.2013 all these questions of law shall form the part of my statement and evidence against Arvind Kejriwal-accused. I had in my personal manuscripts and autobiographical writing two decades before about, detailed the importance of Aam Aadmi in India politics. Since these were deprived, and are matter of recovery by criminal trials, criminal investigations and writs (criminal). In Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, any clearance fraudulently obtained by accused Arvind Kejriwal from E.C.I, who had converted the Aam Aadmi into a party-amounting to forging of manuscripts of mine, cannot be justified in law. The clearance that he deceitfully obtained for ECI was a prima facie illegal act of usurpation of judicial powers/jurisdiction of trial Courts, by medical trial caused by these offenders, including editors contemnors TOI and HT and others. It was done in sub-silentio of the criminal trial cases going on against the accused in this Hon'ble Court and others. It was also in sub silentio of criminal M.P.No.9710/06 in my criminal writ no.861/1997 in which Hon'ble Chief Justice's Court presided over by Mr.Justice Vijender Jain had issued contempt notice to contemnor/respondent Arvind Kejriwal, corrupt PM Manmohan Singh also amongst the others. This matter was hushed up. A Criminal contempt U/Sec.16 of Contempt of the Court Act have been going on in Delhi High Court. The fraudulent clearance from ECI, corrupt officials by accused Arvind Kejriwal was also in sub-silentio of an order and directions by Hon'ble Ld.Ms.Kamini Lau, the then Ld.MM, New Delhi U/Sec.156 (3) Cr.P.C. and U/Sec 420/307 and 395 of IPC against the accused O.P.Kejriwal, the nexus man of Arvind Kejriwal. The order was addressed to Commissioner of Police, New Delhi Mr.Radhey Shyam Gupta who later on become accused in Crl.Complaint No.02/2005 registered in CBI Court of Ld.Ms.Aruna Suresh, Spl.CBI Judge. The same connected transfer matters have been pending in the Court of Ld.N.K.Sharma, CBI Special Judge, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi. The clearance deceitfully obtained from ECI by accused Arvind Kejriwal was also in sub-

silentio of CrI.CC No.184/11 and many CrI.Misc. applications till 2013 registered in the Court of Mr.Chanderjeet Singh, Ld.MM, Rohini Courts, Delhi, the same have been pending in the Court of Mr.Manish Khurana, Ld.MM, Rohini Court, Delhi. FIRs against Arvind Kejriwal and his associates are being tampered by corrupt police at K.N.Katzu Marg, the matters which are being dealt with by Rohini Trial Courts. The offenders of this P.S. have tampered the evidence of mine relating to cases pending in this Hon'ble Court. Arvind Kejriwal, accused has been bending the law by media trial which is absolutely illegal, unconstitutional. All the criminal proceedings and trials initiated by me, indifferent Courts in Delhi preceded the fraudulent and deceitful clearance from ECI for Aaam Aadmi Party deceitfully established. Now, it is prima facie clear that the accused-corporate terrorists with the media offenders with the might of money have been under mining the gravity of rule of law and the trial proceedings in motion against the accused. I have already prayed in the Supreme Court to pass a process of order and directions to the CBI Directors and to arrest these cooperate offenders Anil Aggarwal and Arvind Kejriwal, Arun Kumar Aggarwal and O.P.Kejriwal and to do custodial interrogation to co-operate with trial Courts and in course of criminal investigation.

My representation dated 19.06.2001 vide No.CM/PG/VIP/3225/dated 06.07.2001 forwarded by Rita Kumar, Addl. Secretary to CM to JCP Vigilance, PHQ, New Delhi with orders of Hon'ble Delhi High Court and NHRC dated 16.04.2001, 17.07.1998, 17.11.1999 and others passed for the safety of my own-was conspiratorially revenged and retaliated by O.P.Kejriwal and Arvind Kejriwal and their associates corrupt bureaucrats who were called the most hated, by Mr.Mark Tully, Head of BBC evident in the Tribune, Chandigarh dated 18.02.2002 in article titled as "Bureaucrats most hated in India" by Tully, it is recorded evidence. In view of the facts and circumstances, I am entitled to cite on order and direction of Patna High Court, DB, Hon'ble Mr.Justices Shiv Kriti Singh and Mr.Justice Vikas Jain who had issued non-bailable warrant against a Joint Secretary of the Union Home Ministry to arrest him and the same was evident in The Hindu dated 17.03.2012 the copy of the same is on the record of the High Court on page No.18 of Misc.No.86049/13. Arvind Kejriwal and O.P.Kejriwal against whom may FIRs have been

registered, and a lot of evidence and witnesses have been recorded, deserve to be arrested by non-bailable warrants for custodial interrogation. In FIR No.202/2000 registered at P.S. I.P.Estate by the order of the Ld. ACMM, New Delhi that has been on the record of the Court, against accused O.P.Kejriwal and Ors. U/Sec.420, 120-A & 120-B & Ors., I had given my statement that O.P.Kejriwal had promised to co-operate with me in course of my Ph.D. as a Research Assistant. But he had broken his promise and cheated me, by depriving the intellectual properties and manuscripts of mine. He has been underground evading the process of law, with mala-fide intentions to illegally further publish illegal books by mis-use of my intellectual properties. It is unfortunate that he has not been arrested so far by corrupt police and CBI. In view of the facts and circumstances, the clearance proceedings at ECI obtained by accused Arvind Kejriwal on Aam Aadmi Party, in deceitful and fraudulent manner, and in sub-silencio of criminal proceedings against him and his associates, stand stayed as these fraudulent clearance proceedings at ECI have been against currents of criminal mandatory laws which have been binding upon all the Hon'ble Courts from top Supreme Court to the Trial Courts and others. The corrupt officials of ECI who had over-ridden and acted mala-fide in giving fraudulent clearance to Aam Aadmi Party fraudulently obtained by the accused Arvind Kejriwal and his associates, deserve to be investigated by CBI. The task and function of the rule of law is to regulate the conduct of the human persons in the society or state/India; and in no way the corrupt mis-conduct of the ECI officials can be spared by CBI they are bound to investigate against them in view of my evidence and orders of Hon'ble Delhi High Court, given to CBI Director Ashwani Kumar, New Delhi on 31.12.2008 and the copy of the same given to MOHA on 22.01.2009 that have been recorded evidence. All the statements and evidence of mine detailed in my Crl.Misc. Application filed today shall be the part of evidence and statements of mine. Rampant corruptions at bureaucratic levels in the system of governance have killed moral sense in India. I have already detailed this fact in one of my affidavits filed in Supreme Court and High Court of Delhi and mentioned in this application.

In my affidavit dated 04.05.2013 filed in Supreme Court, filing No.45758 I noted down in para 12 that it is discriminatory

approach on the part of Govt. of India –respondents/IB/MOHA respondents that more than 15 orders of Delhi High Court passed for my safety at the cost of the state are not being enforced in revenge; and the accused Mukesh Ambani & Ors., the part of the corporate terrorists gangs were involved in corruption cases in 2G Spectrum case and Colgate cases are being given Z Category safety by the Govt. of India-respondents-accused are contemnors being prosecuted by me. Supreme Court had pointed out to Ambani and had questioned such cover for rich Mukesh Ambani for safety it was evident in Times of India dated 02.05.2013.

Further examination-in-chief is deferred as it is lunch time.

*(Navita Kumari)
MM/ND/04.06.2013”*

(This being a verbatim reproduction and hence the grammatical, spelling and syntax errors)

39. The statement is a reflection of the paranoia of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey, which ranges from vague feelings of being persecuted. In the absence of any facts that support such perceptions stated by him, the statement is a highly developed, organized and fantastic set of beliefs that are clearly delusional. The firmly held belief of his, lacking any basis in fact, is without any objective evidence or rational argument. He refers to corporate terrorist Anil Aggarwal and his associates committing fraud in connivance with multi-national agents from abroad. It appears that the Anil Aggarwal he refers to is the Chairman of the Sterlite group of Industries, which has been in the news pertaining to some aluminium refinery set up by the company. Sh.Anil Aggarwal is also associated with companies having the name Vedanta and we find a reference in the statement to the Cairn-Vedanta deal involving US\$8.48 billion. He states in his statement on oath that one Arun Kumar Aggarwal who was the agent of Anil Aggarwal filed a Public Interest Litigation which was a surrogate petition, to have the same

dismissed, so that a judicial stamp of approval was accorded to the Cairn-Vedanta deal. He uses the word '*Noora Kushti*' meaning shadow wrestling. He deposes: '*Any order by such gross misleading and misguiding detailed in the FIR, I had mentioned that it shall be a obiter dicta, and have no force of final judgment.*' He then proceeds to make statement against Arvind Kejariwal, the founder of the Aam Admi Party and alleges that the party obtained registration with the Election Commission of India (ECI) by fraud. He states : '*the clearance that he deceitfully obtained from ECI was a prima facie illegal act of usurpation of judicial powers/jurisdiction of trial courts, by media trial caused by these offenders, including editors, contemnors, TOI and HT and others. It was done in sub-silentio of the criminal trial cases going on against the accused.*'

40. The statement made on oath is a mumble-jumble of events published in newspapers and the fantasies of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey. In what manner the same hurt him has not been stated for the reason obviously they do not concern him. The contents of his complaints are equally illusory. To sample one, we refer to the complaint bearing No.M/43/09 pending currently in the court of Sh.Narender Kumar Sharma. Filed on June 03, 2002 (the current number of the year 2009 is due to the fact that upon transfer to a fresh court the matter was renumbered), the complaint is captioned:

“Criminal complaint U/s 420, 120A and B, 307, 395, 341 (and all the offences on record being abetted) IPC 1860, the Prevention of Corruptions Act, Contempt of Court Act; and other provisions of laws – against dacoit Commissioner of Police, A.R.Sharma SHO – Ramesh Chander (accused-dacoit), O.P.Kejariwal – accused – cheat – thug, Sonia Gandhi – accused, K.Natwar Singh, Madhusudhan Bangar – Caretaker – (TMH) – accused – dacoit and others.”

and its pleadings are most inchoate. They read as under:-

“To

*Hon’ble Chief Metropolitan Magistrate
Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH

With profound respect I approach this Hon’ble Court and state as under:

(i) That against theft, dacoity, robbery, cheating (since 1991), attempts to murder, tampering of evidence, and ors. offences – FIRs of complainant have already been pending against heinous/cognizable offences committed by accused – all named. Since all police from local to PHQ – are accused – Respondents, they, in revenge and retaliation, in all nexus with accused, specially O.P.Kejariwal, being bribed and influenced by accused, have not been complying with Cr.P.C. provisions of law u/s. 153 and others, and registering FIRs. Their all reports have been rejected, challenged together with their (IOs)’s credit impeached u/s. 155 Evidence Act, 1872, and fresh complaints filed against them all in accordance with law.

(ii) That on 29.5.2002, moment complainant informed the Security Officer T.M.H. and SHO – ‘accused’ – Ramesh Chander P.S. Ch.Puri, New Delhi; Criminal gangsters – conspirators – O.P.Kejariwal, Ajay Raj Sharma, Commissioner of Police and these named accused became active, revengeful and retaliatory in action by illegally further committing dacoity of these intellectual properties in 7 big bags, 2 boxes, bed-holder with documents – inside it – in criminal conspiracy, they assaulted me first at NMML, TMH, New Delhi and I was harassed and assaulted by SHO, Ramesh Chander. SHO threatened me at P.S. He used challenging words against Ld. MMs/CMM complaint dated 29/5/2002 be seen – is enclosed.

(iii) That due to lapses, delays and in consideration of criminal complaints in time, the ‘accused’, at investigation of conspirator – dacoit – A.R.Sharma, Commissioner of Police, and accused O.P.Kejariwal – have caused further offences and abetted the all offences reported by complainant.

(iv) *That there are 4 'Sharmas' involved in theft and dacoity at T.M.H. New Delhi. A Sharma – nexus has been fetched, bribed and manipulated to favour O.P.Kejariwal because they are getting extra facility and money to do offences.*

(v) *That 5 J.Orders of D.H.Court, 4 Directors of NHRC, and other orders and directions to ensure safety of complainant at NMML, TMH, N.Delhi have been intentionally, conspiratorially, and completely flouted, disobeyed and disregarded to favour O.P.Kejariwal who has flooded money to them. The police from bottom to top have been giving fake stories/evidences to mislead them (illegible).*

(vi) *That during pendency of Crl.Writ No.861/97 (DHC) and Crl.Writ No.D-8779/95 (SCI) – these criminal gangsters – dacoits – have committed day light dacoity assaulting and threatening to kill and harassing the complainant.*

(vii) *That before further criminal investigation(illegible) are ordered to be launched, local police, ACP P.S. Chankyapuri, New Delhi should be directed to restore these intellectual properties boxes and others at the 'spot' of dacoity, theft/robbery committed at store room of NMML, TMH, New Delhi, and in compliance of 5 orders of DHC. Safety of them be ensured. It is only after making occurrence – Reports on the basis of FIRs – against dacoity, robbery, cheating and attempts to murder and tampering of evidences and ors. in cooperation of S.Tiwari – SI and complainant that any other request, after registration of FIRs and then investigations, - that can be attempted/rested upon.*

(viii) *That complainant has made all written complaints to CP Commissioner of Police (PHO) (Crl.FIR.D.No.609-C/27/7/2000/JCP/NDR/NHQ/ND – be recalled and seen, CP, A.R.Sharma is the most irresponsible person instigating real position to cause these offences. He has not instructed local police so far, to register FIRs instructed local police so far, to register FIRs against ... (illegible), dacoity, tampering of evidence.*

(ix) *That some record of SCI pending Criminal writs/DHC writs (cri.) and others – all of complainant – are being tampered by accused – named above.*

(x) *That some instant order for prevention of these cognizable offences – should be passed to appropriate authority/person.*

(xi) *That apprehend these crl. gangsters – dacoits – police – may cause physical injuries – to complainant violating orders of DH Court.*

PRAYER

(i) *Order and direction be passed by passing order on ‘search warrant’ ‘pending’ against O.P.Kejariwal – Govt./public servant; Madhusudan Bhangar – Caretaker of NMML, TMH, New Delhi – to appropriate authority/persons to restore the intellectual properties, boxes and all bags of papers relating to researches/studies of complainant – Ph. Scholar and to uphold rule of law/status quo.*

(ii) *That order and direction be passed to dacoit – Com. Of Police A.R.Sharma, PHQ, N.Delhi to appear in person and to explain why FIRs of complainant against dacoity, cheating, attempts to murder and tampering of evidences cannot be registered.*

(iii) *Order and direction be passed to issuing NBWs to arrest O.P.Kejariwal – Govt. Servant, NMML, TMH, New Delhi – accused (who vitiates the crl. proceedings by his bribery, thuggy and others and put – him in judicial custody for 15 days for interrogation.*

(iv) *Any other order which deem fit to be passed in interest of justice.”*

(This being a verbatim reproduction and hence the grammatical, spelling and syntax errors)

and we only have to say that the learned Judge ought to have

dismissed the same without passing any effective order permitting Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey to seek adjournments. When the learned Metropolitan Magistrate noted in the year 2003 that Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey had referred to the Prevention of Corruption Act, vide order dated February 28, 2003 it was directed that the matter be placed before the District & Sessions Judge who passed an order on July 31, 2003 that the complaint be assigned to the Special Judge dealing with anti-corruption cases and since then the Additional Sessions Judges have been adjourning the matter on some pretext or the other. Similar is the position of all other cases.

41. His pleadings before this Court; the learned Metropolitan Magistrates and his arguments, evidence that he spends hours reading newspapers and researches on the internet principles of law that might assist his case. He latches on to phrases such as '*sub-silentio*' etc. With the passage of time we find that he has moved away from persistence and has entered the zone of insolence and is bordering on turning aggressive and querulant. He has got obsessed by the legal process. His behaviour which is now turning aggressive and querulant is evidenced by the four phrases which such behaviourally affected persons use frequently. They are:

(a) *You are biased.* This accusation is against the Judge, and we find a liberal sprinkling of this phrase in applications filed complaining that Judges are not paying any heed to him.

(b) *I have a right to natural justice.* By this he means '*I have a right to get my way*'.

(c) *What about my human rights?* This appeal by him is not specific to any instance or a fact. He uses it more in the nature of a catch-all phrase to convey a message to the Judge: '*Surely there is a principle of law that can help me and you better find it for me*'.

(d) *Conspiracy and Corruption.* While addressing the Court the favourite words used include the two. The difference between ‘*assertion*’ and ‘*evidence*’ is lost.

42. It is apparent that Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey is an obsessively invested litigant, and given his fixations, increasingly turns to making a grandiose list of complaints and accompanying insults. His anger and contempt has turned into paranoia and delusions. With the passage of time he has become rigid and suspicious. He appears in the Court with many documents and pleadings demanding that all should be read. Often of no relevance to his case, he taunts broad principles of human rights. He denies obviously undisputed facts known to others. What may appear to third parties as conscious lying is fundamentally in his case a passionate belief in the truth of his perceptions. The pattern of behaviour: Pursuit of his personal grievances has seriously damaged him. It has become disruptive to the functioning of the courts. His grievances have steadily grown from the mundane to the grandiose. He reveals grand fantasies of his ultimate vindication, unveiled dramatically before courts. His initial grievance against Sh.O.P.Kejariwal who was the Director of the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library from the year 1997 to the year 2001 has turned into a bizarre, life-engrossing campaign to uncover and bring down ‘*global conspiracies*’.

43. It is a trait of such litigants that pursuing their quest for justice they typically send voluminous communications and one finds that their requests gradually shifts to demands and therefrom to recrimination and finally to threats. They come to regard public figures as the central impediment to their quest. Having laid waste their financial and social fabric, they can be compared to gamblers, with no way out of the devastation they have

wrought, hoping for a really big win.

44. His enthusiasm and passionate engagement in the quest for supposed justice chases an absurd expectation and this is the reason why he creates a chaos in his pursuit. The misplaced enthusiasm is inflated with hopes. His level of pre-occupation with his cause, the ruminative quality of his thinking and the pedantic attention to the minutiae of his case, all suggest obsession.

45. Querulous litigants are of various shades and varieties. They may be simply vexatious litigants. They may be unusually persistent complainants. They may be abnormally persistent complainants. Lastly, they may be those who are in pursuit of idiosyncratic quests amplified by a self-righteous and self-important narcissistic outlook.

46. The pleadings and arguments of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey make it obvious that he is a litigant who falls in the last category. The felt insult may be a real one but perhaps in his case a perceived grievance has stimulated in him the underlying hypersensitivity and vulnerability, leading him to become completely consumed in a self-destructive quest for vindication.

47. The common trait evidenced by litigants who are in pursuit of idiosyncratic quests amplified by a self-righteous and self-important narcissism is the blurring of the distinction between a fantasy and the real and thus their non-understanding of a difference between an '*assertion*' and '*evidence*'. They deny obvious undisputed facts known to others. Prone to paranoia or delusions they decompensate and become acutely psychotic. And as we have observed above they bring disruption to the organization through which they seek their vision of justice. They target the high and the mighty.

48. We have already noted the relevant facts with reference to the names

of the person who Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey has targets. His tirade commences in late 1997 when as per him Sh.O.P.Kejariwal the Director of the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library allowed him to store his belongings in a room in Teen Murti Complex but threw him out and stole his research material. At that time the Government in the Centre was headed by Sh.I.K.Gujral. Sh.Indrajit Gupta was the Union Home Minister and Sh.S.Jaipal Reddy was the Union Minister for Information and Broadcasting. Sh.O.P.Kejariwal had joined Nehru Memorial Museum and Library after having served in the Doordarshan as the CEO of Prasar Bharti under the administrative control of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. This explains him targeting the two Ministers pertaining to his personal dispute which he had, if at all, with Sh.O.P.Kejariwal. The Government led by Sh.Atal Bihari Vajpayee took over on March 19, 1998 and lasted till May 22, 2004. Applications filed by him during this period target the then Union Minister for Home Sh.L.K.Advani, Ms.Sushma Swaraj the Union Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Sh.Arun Jaitley, the Union Minister for Law and Justice, Ms.Uma Bharti, a Member of Parliament of the BJP but prominently in the news. Sh.Soli J.Sorabjee, the Attorney General and Sh.Madan Lal Khurana, the Chief Minister of Delhi. The applications filed by him post June, 2004 till date consistently target Ms.Sonia Gandhi, the President of Indian National Congress, Dr.Manmohan Singh, the Prime Minister of India, Sh.Shivraj Patil and Sh.P.Chitambaram who were the Union Ministers of Home from May, 2004 to November, 2008 and November, 2008 till July, 2012 respectively. He also targets Sh.Pranab Mukherjee. His fixation against all those who have held office of the Union Minister for Home is writ large. During arguments he repeatedly wanted this Court to allot him a suite in Western Court, Janpath and preferably Suite

No.6 or 7. It is not strange that as pleaded by him in the writ petition he has pleaded that the said suites were unauthorizedly occupied by Sh.Indrajit Gupta.

49. To put it plainly, Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey admits of having no proof of what he alleges. But he blames the judiciary and the police for proof being lost because as per him no cognizance was taken of his complaints when his research material was stolen and used by Sh.O.P.Kejariwal to publish a book. We have already analyzed the possible material which he could have gathered while researching for his topic to opine that there is no conceivable connection with the same and the subject on which Sh.O.P.Kejariwal has authored his book. From the fact that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal's book was published in the year 1988 we have highlighted the conclusive fact that Sh.O.P.Kejariwal could not have used research material coalesced by him because as per him he came to Delhi in the year 1988 to research at the National Archives of India and Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. The first possible instance of any belonging of his being stolen could not be before the year 1994 or 1995 because he claims that when he came to Delhi in the year 1988, he stayed in a dormitory on the 4th floor of Bihar Bhawan at Kautaliya Marg and after a while he shifted to a tenanted room in flat No.204, South Avenue allotted to one Dr.R.K.Kusumaria, a Member of Parliament from Madhya Pradesh. He claims that the theft took place when he was residing in said flat. In the Crl.Writ Petition he makes a reference that for the first time he had approached the police at PS Chankaya Puri to lodge an FIR on March 18, 1997. Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey's journey commenced in this Court with the writ petition filed in December, 1997 making reference to a grievance that the police was not registering an FIR on his complaint dated March 18, 1997

and it is only later on that we find he claiming being assaulted and his intellectual properties stolen even earlier.

50. The fantasies, illusions and delusions of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey pertaining to a global conspiracy against him have been noted by us with reference to what he argued before us and we find its reflection in the statement made by him on oath before Ms.Navita Kumari, MM, New Delhi on February 26, 2013.

51. This is the reason why he claims that he need not produce any evidence because of the fact that he being an expert, his opinion is evidenced as per Section 45 of the Evidence Act. We need not discuss as to what kind of expert opinion is evidence under Section 45 of the Evidence Act.

52. With reference to the conduct of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey we have already highlighted that he exhibits a pattern of behaviour involving the unusual persistent pursuit of an imaginary grievance thereby not only causing serious self-inflicted damage to him but additionally to the functioning of the Courts while attempting to resolve his claim. The proof is the numerous proceedings initiated by him in different Courts which we have listed in the schedule to this decision and we find that in all of them he wants FIRs to be registered against all and sundry for imaginary threats and atrocities committed; and the underlying signature tune which initially was that everybody was acting to protect Sh.O.P.Kejariwal has now shifted to a global conspiracy against him. He is obsessed with the fixation that the Punjabi terrorists who are sponsored by different nations have managed to install a Sikh as the Prime Minister of India with the object of terrorising and torturing him. Thus we find the name of Dr.Manmohan Singh all pervasive in his current pleadings. Observations of Courts pertaining to

corruption are being linked to the Prime Minister of India under a grandiose scheme to destroy the economy of this country.

53. Any attempt by us to directly confront his misconception would be a mistake. His misconceptions being a product of intense suspicion and lengthy self-justification would further entrench his position if any attempt is made to confront his misconceptions. **Thus, it would be potentially more productive for us to clarify the limitations inherent in the courts and complaints procedures that cannot provide the type of retribution and vindication sought, however justified the cause may be. After all, courts are about adjudication, compensation, reparation and in today's environment even conciliation and not about retribution and personal vindication.**

54. Thus the issues which he raises are beyond the management of this Court. Since he suffers enormous damage to his personal, social and psychological functioning in his pursuit, he is and ought to be the subject of concern of professionals in psychology who can provide insights conducive to him. He would be better managed by the Social Welfare Department of the Government of Delhi than by a court. He has already imposed significant burdens on the courts by wasting judicial time.

55. We have no hesitation to conclude that the proceedings initiated by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey in W.P.(CrI.) No.861/1997 have to be immediately terminated by dismissing the same, for the reliefs he prays for as also the reliefs he prays for in the various pending miscellaneous applications cannot be granted; but issuing suitable directions to the State to discharge the constitutional obligation to render such psychological and material help as may be required, and for which we shall issue directions at the destination of our opinion.

56. But what about the various proceedings initiated by him, and most of which are complaint cases filed by him before different Magistrates.

57. We had summoned the record of all cases pending before different learned Judges and have perused the same. It is the usual story. For imaginary and fictitious incidents, complaints are filed seeking directions against the police to investigate. The targets of the complaints are the different public figures whose names we have noted while referring to his tirade. Not knowing how to handle litigants like him, we find that the learned Magistrates, raw in experience, have passed orders seeking status report to be filed by the SHO of the concerned police station in area whereof he claims a wrong was committed against him. Some of them have followed the letter of the law by recording on oath his statement as a complaint. One such statement recorded in part by a learned Metropolitan Magistrate has been noted by us in paragraph 38 above. What we find is the Magistrates are overlooking the fact that there is no factual basis for the complaint. Everything is imaginary.

58. We had a first hand experience of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey as he addressed arguments spanning nearly seven hours spread over three days. Before that, one of us; Pradeep Nandrajog, J. had sampled him as a puisne Judge sitting with the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the Delhi High Court for three weeks from September 03, 2013 till September 20, 2013. He would troop into the room of the Hon'ble Chief Justice every day at 10:30 AM sharp and lecture on all and sundry, pestering the Chief Justice to issue immediate directions to arrest somebody or direct an immediate listing or an immediate hearing of his case. Between 15 minutes to 45 minutes were wasted virtually every day. On a few days he would trouble the court even after lunch hours and his tirade would continue. He would make grievance

against the Bench which was seized of his writ petition.

59. Dealing with the constitutionality of the Anti Vexatious Litigation (Prevention) Act, 1949 by the State of Tamil Nadu, in the decision reported as AIR 1965 SC 1827 Prabhakar Rao H.Mawle Vs. State of A.P. the Supreme Court observed that vexatious litigants can be checked from approaching courts to prevent harassing the opposite party. In the decision reported as 2010 (3) SCC 402 State of Uttranchal Vs. Balwant Singh Chauhal & Ors. the Supreme Court stressed the imperative need to weed out the menace of vexatious public interest litigations filed without the necessary preliminary study of facts; and we are of the opinion that the same principle could be applied in an extreme case of the kind we are dealing with i.e. a litigant who brings imaginaries before the court and wants cases to be registered; possessed of the only evidence under Section 45 of the Evidence Act: the argument being that since I am an expert, whatever I say is evidence. The Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court, in the decision reported as 2003 (2) SCC 45 Ex.Captain Harish Uppal Vs. UOI said: *‘Courts of law are structured in such a design as to evoke respect and reverence to the majesty of law and justice. The machinery for dispensation of justice according to law is operated by the court. Proceedings inside the Court are always expected to be held in dignified and ordinary manner.’*

60. Though in Harish Uppal’s case (supra) the Supreme Court was concerned with regulating counsel behaviour in court, but the principle of law we find would be that it is the duty of a court to take such measures which are necessary to regulate the court’s proceedings and to maintain an orderly functioning of the court. This principle would apply equally whether the malefactor is a party appearing in person.

61. In the opinion reported as AIR 1955 SC 1033 Hari Vishnu Kamath

Vs. Ahmad Ishaque the power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India was held to be both judicial as also administrative. In the opinion reported as 2006 (12) SCC 148 Anil Kumar Vithal Shete Vs. State of Maharashtra the Supreme Court held that Articles 227 and 233 to 237 of the Constitution of India make it explicitly clear that the High Court has to take care of and exercise control over courts subordinate to it and *this power of superintendence and control includes inter-alia to guide, advice and encourage Judges of subordinate courts to exercise their powers, discharge their duties and perform their functions independently, fearlessly and objectively.* In the opinion reported as 1974 (2) SCC 831 Shamsher Singh Vs. State of Punjab the Supreme Court observed that the members of the subordinate judiciary were not only under the control, *but were also under the care and custody,* of the High Court and that the members of the subordinate judiciary look up to the High Court *not only for discipline but also for dignity.*

62. The Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court in the opinion reported as AIR 1957 All. 414 Aidal Singh Vs. Karam Singh observed that exercising power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India a High Court discharges its obligation as the custodian of all justice within the territorial limits of its jurisdiction. In the opinion reported as 1972 (1) SCC 898 Ahmedabad Manufacturing and Calico Printing Co. Ltd. Vs. Ram Tahel Ramanand the Supreme Court held that power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India can be exercised by the court suo moto. In the opinion reported as 2000 (2) SCC 636 G.Sagar Suri Vs. State of U.P. the Supreme Court held that the inherent power of a court of record has to be exercised to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. In the opinion reported as 1998 (5) SCC 749 Pepsi Foods Ltd. Vs.

Special Judicial Magistrate the Supreme Court observed that where the criminal law was set in motion by a person without justification by filing frivolous complaints which are *ex-facie* without merit, the High Court has vast power, to prevent the abuse of the process of law, to quash the same. In the opinion reported as 2005 (1) SCC 122 Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Vs. Mohammad Sharaful Haque, with reference to the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. the Supreme Court observed that the inherent power could be exercised in three circumstances; namely: (i) to give effect to an order under the Criminal Procedure Code; (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of court; and (iii) to otherwise secure the ends of justice.

63. Keeping in view the imaginary facts, full of delusions and illusions; assertions without any evidence, pleaded by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey before the learned Metropolitan Magistrates and other Judges, and additionally the frivolous and vexatious nature of his complaints, emerging as a result of the idiosyncratic beliefs harboured by him, to prevent abuse of the process of court we quash all proceedings which are pending and listed in the Schedule to this decision.

64. It would be useless to proceed against him for having committed contempt of this Court and thus we discharge notice framing contempt proceedings against him dated February 19, 1998 and accordingly we dismiss Cont.Cas (Crl.) 3/1998 on the Courts own motion against Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey. All applications pending therein are dismissed.

65. We dismiss Cont.Cas.(Crl.) No.17/2008 which has simply been adjourned from time to time for the reason the gibberish pleadings therein are imaginary and the prayer is most unintelligible.

66. But, the State has to discharge its constitutional obligation to care for

its citizen who finds himself in distress and stress. In his idiosyncratic quest for justice Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey has totally destroyed himself and needs help. The same has to be in the form of counselling by a Psychologist and even monetary help. Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey needs aid for being rehabilitated, to whatever extent he can be, in the society.

67. We direct the Director of the Social Welfare Department of the Government of NCT Delhi to forthwith provide boarding and lodging to Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey at a suitable Rehabilitation Home. A Psychologist would be provided to interact with him, with a view to free him from the escalating psychosomatic maladies inflicting Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey so that in him is fostered a new humanitarian, habilitative culture, tuned to the promising values of dignity and decency. Regretfully, though these objectives tantalize us but they exclude our grasp.

68. All proceedings initiated by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey, since quashed, shall be consigned to the record room by the concerned courts.

69. Should we bar the entry of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey in courts? Tempted as we would be to do so, we have to keep in mind that access to justice is a social and a fundamental right and is treated in matured democracies as a pre-condition for existence and survival of the rule of law. Inherent in the expression '*access to justice*' is not only the use of the judicial system but first and foremost the physical entry thereto.

70. We cannot deny Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey physical access to courts by putting a blanket bar for the reason he is currently litigating with his landlord on the subject of he being evicted from the tenanted premises. We find that on September 13, 2013, the ex-parte decree for eviction obtained by the landlord on January 03, 2013 was executed by breaking the locks and the goods lying in the house were entrusted on superdari to Ms.Babita, the

wife of the landlord. Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey would be entitled to take possession of the said goods and for which he has to physically access the court.

71. But, law recognizes that the right to access a Court can be subjected to limitations as long as they do not impair the very essence of the right to access to the courts and as long as the restrictions pursue a legitimate and proportionate aim. Such orders are sustainable so long as there is a reasonable relationship and proportionality between the means employed and the aims sought to be achieved as was held in the opinion reported as (2001) EWCA Civ 340 *Ebert Vs. Official Receiver* and the opinion reported as 1999 (3) WLR 670 *Ebert Vs. Venvil* which used the expression *a court has a right to regulate its processes as it thinks fit since its remedies are proportionate to the identified abuse.*

72. Accordingly, we direct that henceforth, no proceedings initiated by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey shall be taken cognizance of by any court subordinate to this Court except when he obtains leave from the concerned District & Sessions Judge, and as regards this Court, till he obtains a permission in writing from the Standing Counsel (Criminal/Civil) appointed by the State Government to represent the State in the Delhi High Court; depending upon whether the proceedings intended to be initiated by Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey are criminal or civil. The concerned District & Sessions Judge as also the Administrative Civil Judge of the court complex concerned would be empowered not to permit Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey to enter the precincts of the court building unless he intends to file an application seeking permission from the concerned District & Sessions Judge to initiate a proceeding and if physical access is allowed, the concerned District & Sessions Judge or the Administrative Civil Judge would be entitled to direct

a security personnel to be present with Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey to ensure that he accesses the court of the concerned District & Sessions Judge and no other court. If Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey is granted permission to pursue a proceeding, while permitting him access to the court premises, such regulatory measures could be imposed which ensure that he goes only to the court concerned and no other. Similarly would be the position if Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey obtains permission from the Standing Counsel (Criminal/Civil) to initiate a proceeding in this Court. As regards the proceedings pending in which Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey is a party, which proceedings have not been quashed by us, while permitting access to the Court the concerned District & Sessions Judge would be empowered to likewise impose any regulatory measure to ensure that Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey goes only to the Court where his presence is required and does not create a nuisance for other learned Judges.

73. We are directing as above in the preceding paragraph since we have witnessed Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey entering a court irrespective of whether or not his matter is listed in the court and going on a tirade.

74. We appoint Sh.Vivek Kumar Tandon, Advocate, 404, Lawyers' Chamber, Delhi High Court, New Delhi-110503 whose consent we have taken to ensure compliance with the present decision with regard to the direction issued to the Director of the Social Welfare Department, Government of NCT Delhi. Since Sh.Vivek Kumar Tandon is a panel lawyer for the Government of NCT Delhi, we have troubled him to do the needful. We make it clear that should Sh.Vivek Kumar Tandon be of the opinion that any further directions are required pertaining to the rehabilitation of Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey, he would be at liberty to move an application which shall be taken on record by the Registry without any court

fee paid and listed as a miscellaneous application before the Court along with the copy of the present order; and not the entire voluminous bulky record of the criminal writ petition.

75. To summarize, W.P.(Crl.) 861/1997 and all pending applications therein are disposed of in terms of para 55, 63, 67, 68, 72, 73 and 74 above. Contempt Case (Crl.) 3/1998 is disposed of discharging the notice of contempt issued to Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey. Contempt Case (Crl.) 17/2008 is dismissed.

76. Two copies of this decision be supplied today itself to Ms.Zubeda Begum, Standing Counsel Government of NCT of Delhi under the signatures of Court Master; one for departmental action pertaining to the directions issued in para 67 above, and the other to be supplied to Sh.Uma Shankar Pandey under acknowledgment.

(PRADEEP NANDRAJOG)
JUDGE

(V. KAMESWAR RAO)
JUDGE

October 08, 2013

Mamta

SCHEDULE

Proceedings pending in the Court of Mr.S.K.Sarvaria, District & Sessions Judge,(North-West) Rohini

1.	Misc. Crl. Complaint-89/12	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs.Union of India etc.
2.	Misc. App.-12/12	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs.Union of India etc.
3.	M-86/13	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs.Union of India etc.
4.	Misc-98/13	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs.Union of India etc.

Proceedings Pending in the Court of Mr.Chander Shekhar, District & Sessions Judge, (North)

1.	M/57/13	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. U.O.I.
----	---------	----------------------------------

Proceedings Pending in the Court of Mr.Sanjeev Kumar, Addl. Sessions Judge (North)

1.	M2/11	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. U.O.I.
----	-------	----------------------------------

Proceedings Pending in the Court of Mr.Manish Khurana, MM, Rohini Court

1.	M-01/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
2.	M-02/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
3.	M-03/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
4.	M-04/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
5.	M-05/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
6.	M-06/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
7.	M-07/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
8.	M-09/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
9.	M-10/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
10.	M-11/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
11.	M-12/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
12.	M-13/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI

13.	M-15/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
14.	M-16/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
15.	M-18/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
16.	M-19/4/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
17.	CC 848/1/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI
18.	CC 666/1/13	Uma Shankar Pandey vs. UOI

Proceedings Pending in the Court of Mr.Narender Kumar Sharma, Special Judge (CB), Tis Hazari Courts

1.	01/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
2.	02/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
3.	03/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
4.	04/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
5.	05/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
6.	06/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
7.	07/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
8.	08/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
9.	09/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
10.	10/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
11.	11/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
12.	12/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
13.	13/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
14.	14/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
15.	15/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
16.	16/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
17.	17/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey

		(President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
18.	18/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
19.	19/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
20.	20/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
21.	21/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
22.	22/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
23.	23/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
24.	24/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
25.	25/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
26.	26/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
27.	27/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
28.	28/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
29.	29/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
30.	30/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
31.	31/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
32.	32/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
33.	33/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
34.	34/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
35.	35/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
36.	36/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
37.	37/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
38.	38/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.

39.	39/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
40.	40/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
41.	41/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
42.	42/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
43.	43/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
44.	44/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
45.	45/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
46.	46/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
47.	47/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
48.	48/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
49.	49/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
50.	50/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
51.	51/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
52.	52/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
53.	53/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
54.	54/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
55.	55/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
56.	56/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
57.	57/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
58.	58/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
59.	59/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
60.	60/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey

		(President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.
61.	61/2009	Uma Shankar Pandey (President of W.A.S.) Vs. U.O.I. & Ors.

**Proceedings pending in the Court of Ms.Navita Kumari Bagha, M.M.,
New Delhi**

S. No.	Case Number	Title of the case
1.	CC No.9465/1/99	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
2.	CC No.9779/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
3.	CC No.9801/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
4.	CC No.9787/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
5.	CC No. 9777/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
6.	CC No. 9502/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
7.	CC No. 9793/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
8.	CC No.9468/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
9.	CC No.9772/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
10.	CC No.9792/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
11.	CC No.9782/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
12.	CC No.9798/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
13.	CC No.9776/1/00	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
14.	CC No.9771/1/01	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
15.	CC No.9795/1/01	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
16.	CC No.9802/1/01	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
17.	CC No.9808/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
18.	CC No.9462/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
19.	CC No.9791/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
20.	CC No.9780/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
21.	CC No.9806/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
22.	CC No.9785/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
23.	CC No.9774/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
24.	CC No.9797/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
25.	CC No.9784/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
26.	CC No.9807/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
27.	CC No.9781/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
28.	CC No.9464/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
29.	CC No.9467/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
30.	CC No.9470/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
31.	CC No.9809/1/02	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
32.	CC No.9460/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
33.	CC No.9463/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
34.	CC No.9459/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
35.	CC No.9461/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.

36.	CC No.9778/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
37.	CC No.9789/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
38.	CC No.9511/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
39.	CC No. 9775/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
40.	CC No.9773/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
41.	CC No.9803/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
42.	CC No.9799/1/03	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
43.	CC No.98/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
44.	CC No.9790/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
45.	CC No.9186/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
46.	CC No.9804/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
47.	CC No.9805/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
48.	CC No.9469/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
49.	CC No.9788/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
50.	CC No.64/2/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
51.	CC No.9800/1/04	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. O.P. Kejriwal & Ors.
52.	CC No.9811/1/05	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
53.	CC No.9796/1/05	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
54.	CC No.10450/1/06	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
55.	CC No.871/2/06	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
56.	CC No.1182B/1/06	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
57.	CC No.10449/1/06	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.
58.	CC No.687/1/07	Uma Shankar Pandey Vs. UOI & Ors.

**(PRADEEP NANDRAJOG)
JUDGE**

**(V. KAMESWAR RAO)
JUDGE**

October 08, 2013

Mamta