

In Re News Item Published In Indian Express (The Sunday Express), Titled "V.K. Singh

v.

ABC

(Supreme Court Of India)

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.M. LODHA HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.L. GOKHALE

Suo Motu Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 9 Of 2013 In W.P.(C) No. 26 Of 2012 | 20-11-2013

1. In response to the notice issued pursuant to the order dated 01.10.2013, a reply is filed by the Contemnor No. 1 - General V.K. Singh (Retd.). In the reply, inter alia, it is stated as follows:-

"... I fully respect the Constitution of India as also the institutions created by it. I have the highest respect for the Judiciary particularly this Hon'ble Court... I hereby tender an unqualified apology."

2. Mr. Ram Jethmalani, learned senior counsel appearing for the Contemnor No. 1, states that the Contemnor No. 1 withdraws the entire statement concerning Judiciary made by him in Hindi and English to Asia News International (ANI) on 21.09.2013. Learned senior counsel further states that the Contemnor No. 1 also withdraws all other statements made by him with regard to this Court in earlier interviews after the order of this Court dated 10.02.2012.

3. The Contemnor No. 1 - General V.K. Singh (Retd.) is personally present. Mr. Ram Jethmalani, learned senior counsel, made the above statements in his presence.

4. The apology is tendered by the Contemnor No. 1 - General V.K. Singh (Retd.) at the earliest possible opportunity without contesting the notice at all. The apology tendered by him appears to us to be bona fide. We accept the same.

5. Contemnor No. 2 - Ramesh Chander Malhotra - in response to the notice has filed his affidavit on 17.10.2013. In the affidavit, Contemnor No. 2 has stated as follows:-

"... I again on behalf of the Indian Express and my own behalf offer my unqualified complete sincere apology.."

6. We accept the apology tendered by Contemnor No. 2.

7. Although in our order dated 23.10.2013, we had indicated that we would like to hear Mr. F.S. Nariman, learned senior counsel for the Contemnor No. 2 on diverse issues that may arise for consideration in the Contempt Petition but now since both contemnors have tendered unqualified and unconditional apology, we do not think any further hearing in the matter is necessary.

8. We, accordingly, discharge the notice and drop the contempt proceedings.

9. Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No. 22248 of 2013 for intervention is rejected.