

**PRINCIPLED STAND OF THE CONCERNED CITIZENS  
REGARDING THE STATEMENTS RELEASED BY CERTAIN  
PARTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE JUDGMENT OF THE  
SUPREME COURT OF INDIA IN THE CASE OF SUO MOTU  
CONTEMPT PETITION (CRL.) NO.1 OF 2020 IN RE:  
PRASHANT BHUSHAN AND ANR.**

The Supreme Court in the aforementioned case has pronounced a judgment dated 14.08.2020 holding the alleged contemnors, including Shri Prashant Bhushan, Senior Advocate, guilty of contempt of the Court.

In response to such judgment of the Supreme Court, multiple negatively oriented articles have been published, alleging that the Supreme Court is muzzling criticism of the process of justice delivery system in a democratic country. A statement dated 15.8.2020 has also been issued by one 'Campaign for Judicial Accountability and Reforms', (CJAR), condemning the judgment and further calling upon the Supreme Court, and every Judge, to reconsider their decision.

We, the concerned citizens of the country, are deeply concerned by such statements by a group of persons who wrongly claim themselves to solely represent the civil society, and use every opportunity to strike at the roots of Indian democratic institutions such as the Parliament, Election Commission of India, and now, the Supreme Court of India.

We had, in this regard, submitted a petition to the Hon'ble President of India on the 30th of July, 2020. Stray groups with hidden political agendas, claiming to be the sole custodians of Constitution and Democracy, cannot be allowed to denigrate the democratic institutions, in particular the Supreme Court of India.

This is not the first time that Mr. Prashant Bhushan has objectionally criticized the Courts without any basis or evidence. This is also not the first occasion when he has made

utterances which were inflammatory in nature. CJAR, counts, amongst its committee, Shri Prashant Bhushan himself, apart from a few others such as Ms. Arundhati Roy etc; which shows that they are working on an agenda to plead their own cause extra-judicially.

For a Senior Advocate of the Supreme Court, contempt of the Court is something which cannot be justified by any pressure group. The legal profession is a solemn and serious occupation, with Constitutional, professional and ethical obligations. Any violation of the principles of professional ethics by an advocate is unfortunate and unacceptable.

As Lord Denning in the case of Morris Vs. Crown Office reported in (1970) 2 QB 114 corresponding to (1970) 2 WBLR 792 said, "the course of justice must not be deflected or interfered with. Those who strike at it strikes at the very foundations of our society."

The statements issued by CJAR and a few other pressure groups condemning the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and criticising the process of judgment delivery is highly objectionable and unacceptable. We, the concerned citizens, unequivocally oppose such pseudo activism hidden in the garb of the Civil Society.

-----List of Signatories---