

## News

---

**A Delhi court fines Mehmood Pracha ₹6 lakh for attempting to have the Ayodhya ruling regarding CJI Chandrachud's remarks overturned.**



According to the Court, CJI **Chandrachud's** allusion to "praying to God" in order to resolve the issue was a spiritual reflection rather than an admission of prejudice or outside intervention.

Advocate Mehmood Pracha recently had his application to declare the Supreme Court's 2019 Ayodhya ruling invalid denied by a Delhi District Court.

A civil court judgment dismissing Pracha's claim over the matter was contested in his plea before the District Court.

According to Pracha, in a speech last year, former Chief Justice of India (CJI) DY Chandrachud, one of the five judges on the Supreme Court bench that rendered the decision, acknowledged that the Ayodhya ruling was rendered in line with a "solution provided to him by Bhagwan Shri Ram Lala Virajmaan," the deity who was one of the plaintiffs in the Ayodhya title dispute.

According to Patiala House Courts District Judge Dharmender Rana, Pracha's lawsuit was "**frivolous, misconceived, and an abuse of the judicial process.**"

In addition to the ₹1 lakh fine that the trial court had mandated Pracha pay, the court assessed him fees of ₹6 lakh.

It is clear that the fine imposed by the lower trial court has not had the desired deterrence impact. Therefore, I firmly believe that the cost amount should be appropriately increased to achieve the intended outcomes in order to effectively curb the threat of pointless and opulent litigation," the Court stated.

Notably, Justice Chandrachud stated that he had prayed to God for a resolution in the Ayodhya issue in his speech, the English version of which was made accessible in the court ruling.

In a civil suit, Pracha, a practicing attorney, sought a declaration that the 2019 Ayodhya ruling was invalid. He requested guidance for a "new adjudication" of the case. Through his next acquaintance, former CJI Dhananjay Chandrachud, he also included Shri Ram Lala Virajmaan as a defendant in his lawsuit.

In April 2025, the trial court denied his plea and assessed ₹1 lakh in fees for procedural abuse. Pracha went to the District Court to contest the order.

District Judge Rana concluded that Chandrachud's statement to "praying before God" was a spiritual reflection rather than an admission of prejudice or outside intervention in the October 18 ruling, which included quotes from the Ayodhya ruling and the former CJI's address.

Due to a likely misinterpretation of the law and religion, the appellant Pracha appears to have

overlooked the crucial distinction between the **"Supreme God" and the "Juristic Personality" that is litigating before the court. The Court observed, "It seems that the appellant has not bothered to read the Ayodhya case judgment, otherwise such a confusion would not have arisen in his mind."**

Judge Rana further underlined that asking for heavenly direction in one's own faith cannot be considered legal "fraud."

**"Therefore, neither in law nor in any religion, asking the Almighty for guidance can be condemned as a dishonest act to obtain an unfair advantage,"** the Court stated.

It further found that the Judges Protection Act of 1985, which forbids civil or criminal lawsuits against judges for conduct taken while they are doing their judicial duties, precluded Pracha's suit.

The Court further stated that Pracha had incorrectly named former CJI Chandrachud as the deity's "next friend" while failing to name other relevant persons from the Ayodhya case.

Judge Rana concluded by bemoaning the increasing trend of targeting public servants after they retire and urging the Bar and the judiciary to serve as guardians against these **"malicious and malefic assaults."**

When the guardian himself becomes a predator, the situation gets upsetting. Even though the appellant in this case is a very senior counsel, he has chosen to wear a jersey of the incorrect hue. He has chosen to exacerbate the issue rather than contribute to its resolution. The Court noted that in addition to filing a fraudulent and baseless lawsuit, the appellant in this case also filed an utterly extravagant and baseless appeal.

Therefore, it increased the sentence imposed on Pracha to ₹6 lakh and affirmed the trial court's decision to dismiss his suit.