

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

**CWP No.16627 of 2026
Date of Decision: 23.09.2026**

Neena Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

Bar Counsel of Himachal Pradesh & Anr.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioners: Petitioner present in person.

Mr. Abhimanyu Rathore, present in person.

For the respondents: Mr. Sunil Mohan Goel, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vipul Sharda & Mr. Raman Jamalta,
Advocates.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

Precisely, the grouse of the petitioner, as has been highlighted in the petition and further canvassed by the petitioner present in person, Ms. Neena Rani, is that she had applied for enrolment as an Advocate vide application dated 29.7.2026 with the Bar Council of Himachal Pradesh, but till date, no action has been taken upon her application.

2. Having regard to the nature of dispute/prayer made on behalf of the petitioner, this Court called upon Mr. Vipul Sharda, learned counsel for the respondents, to have instructions from the Bar Council of Himachal Pradesh that why till date, application made by the petitioner has not been processed.

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid directions issued by this Court, Mr. Sunil Mohan Goel, learned Senior Counsel, duly assisted by Mr. Vipul Sharda, learned counsel for the respondents, apprised this Court that before application dated 29.07.2026 submitted by the petitioner for her enrolment as an Advocate could be considered, one complaint dated 24.7.2026, which was received in the Bar Council of Himachal Pradesh on 30.07.2026, specifically alleging therein that a number of criminal complaints/cases are pending against the applicant/petitioner, Ms. Neena Rani and as such, in terms of the provisions contained under the Advocates Act, her prayer for enrolment may not be considered. Mr. Goel states that complainant was called upon to place on record material to substantiate his allegations contained in the application dated 24.7.2026, received on 30.7.2026, but he failed to do so for considerable time, but has now made available the material as was asked for and now the Enrolment Committee, after hearing both the parties, shall take a decision expeditiously.

4. Mr. Abhimanyu Rathore, Advocate, attempted to intervene at this stage on the ground that he has instructions to appear on behalf of the complainant, who is admittedly not a party before this Court in the instant proceedings, to state that in terms of various provisions contained under Advocates Act, 1961, petitioner cannot be enrolled as an advocate.

5. This Court, having regard to the innocuous prayer made by the petitioner, is not inclined to adjudicate the case on its own merits, rather having taken note of the statement made by Mr. Sunil Mohan Goel, learned Senior Advocate, that application made by the petitioner shall be decided by the Enrolment Committee expeditiously, deems it fit to dispose of the same with a direction to the Bar Council of Himachal Pradesh to decide the application dated 29.7.2026 submitted by the petitioner expeditiously, preferably within a period of two weeks. Ordered accordingly. Needless to say, Bar Council of Himachal Pradesh, while doing the needful in terms of the instant order, shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as other stakeholders, including the complainant.

6. Before proceeding further with the matter in terms of the order passed by this Court, Secretary, Bar Council of Himachal Pradesh, may ensure that copy of the complaint with complete annexures, i.e. documents, if any, supplied by the complainant, is supplied to the petitioner, enabling her to submit her reply accordingly.

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms, along with pending application(s), if any.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

September 23, 2026
(sunil)