

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT JABALPUR  
MCRC No. 14288 of 2026  
(JAGDISH VARKADE Vs THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH)

**Dated : 08-05-2026**

Shri Sudeep Singh Saini - Advocate for the applicant.

Smt. Nalini Gurung - Panel Lawyer for the respondent/State.

---

This Court on the preceding date of hearing i.e. 06.05.2026 passed the following order:-

"During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the applicant submitted that in other matters of similar nature arising under the Essential Commodities Act, this Court has granted bail to accused persons who were represented by senior advocates and that denial of similar relief to the present applicant merely because his counsel is a junior advocate would not be appropriate.

The aforesaid submission, prima facie, attributes extraneous considerations to the judicial functioning of the Court and appears to be derogatory to the dignity of the High Court. Learned counsel has, however, failed to place before this Court any order passed in such allegedly similar matters.

Accordingly, learned counsel for the applicant is directed to place on record a copy of orders passed in the alleged similar matters for perusal of this Court on the next date of hearing, so as to substantiate the submission advanced at Bar.

List on 08.05.2026."

Counsel for the applicant Shri Sudeep Singh Saini submits that neither he is aware of nor is he in possession of any order passed by this Court wherein bail has been granted in a similar matter to any Senior Advocate or any Advocate.

When Shri Saini is asked why he had made a statement on 06.05.2026 without any basis, he tried to clarify that his statement was largely focused upon an order passed by a Co-ordinate Bench in MCrC No.6131/2026 (Ramprasad

Vishya v. The State of Madhya Pradesh) on 19.02.2026.

Earlier, the statement made at Bar by Shri Saini was found to be an extraneous consideration touching upon the judicial functioning of this Court and *prima facie* appeared derogatory to the dignity of this Court and contemptuous in nature.

When this Court asked Shri Saini why the contempt proceedings be not initiated against him, he submitted that the statement he made was not intended to suggest any such order passed by this Court and he was not intended to show anything against the dignity of this Court. He further fairly submitted that if this Court found anything contemptuous, he apologizes for the same. Shri Saini has tendered unconditional apology at this stage.

Considering the aforesaid, when Shri Saini tendered his apology, this Court is not inclined to initiate contempt proceeding against him, however, cautioning him to remain conscious of the sanctity of judicial proceedings and to be specific and circumspect while making submissions before this Court.

The matter be listed for consideration of bail application in the next week.

(RAMKUMAR CHOUBEY)  
JUDGE