

\$~39

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 8221/2016 & C.M. No.36491/2016
HARITA SUNIL PARAB Petitioner

Through Petitioner in person.

versus

REGISTRAR GENERAL, SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Anoopam N. Prasad, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

% **05.10.2016**

W.P.(C) 8221/2016

The petitioner is a practising Advocate. She has been enrolled in the Bar Council of Maharashtra in the year 2014. Her submission is that she is practising in various Court not only in Bombay but also in other Courts of the country including the Apex Court. In the month of March, 2016, she had made a complaint to the Chief Justice of India against some Judges of the High Court of Bombay. In that regard, she had come to Delhi as she did not get a response on her complaint. She had been permitted entry in the Apex Court on 22.08.2016, 23.08.2016 & 24.08.2016. This was in connection with the aforementioned complaint. However on 25.08.2016, when she had sought to enter Supreme Court premises, she had been informed by the PRO that her entry had been barred by higher Authorities. She addressed a letter to the Chief Justice of India complaining about this fact. Since she did not receive a response, she has filed the aforementioned petition.

The prayer in the present petition is two-fold; her first prayer is

to call for the records of the respondent to produce the order by which her entry to the Apex Court premises had been barred; the second prayer is to give direction to the respondent not to curtail her entry in the Apex Court as and when she intends to visit the Supreme Court.

The respondent has been represented. His instructions are that as on date, there is no bar to the petitioner entering the premises of the Apex Court; in fact she had never been barred entry on any date. Entry passes for 03.10.2016 & 04.10.2016 substantiating the submission that the petitioner had in fact visited Court No.1 on the aforetoed dates is taken on record. The petitioner also does not dispute that she had gone to Court No.1 of the Supreme Court on 03.10.2016 & 04.10.2016.

The stand of the respondent is clear. It is clear that the entry of the petitioner has neither been barred on earlier occasions and nor does the respondent have any intention to bar her entry in the future. The instructions in writing of the Registrar of the Supreme Court to the learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent have also been placed on record. The various dates on which the petitioner had visited the Supreme Court have been delineated which as per the Visitors Management System of the Apex Court reflects that on 22.08.2016, 23.08.2016 & 24.08.2016, the petitioner had gone to the Supreme Court. She had met Mr. Rakesh Sharma, P.R./Deputy Registrar on 29.08.2016 on which date she had filed an SLP at the filing counter. On 15.09.2016, she was issued a photo entry pass for consultation purposes. In terms of her grievance, she was also accorded a meeting with Justice Bhanumati and in fact she met her on

20.09.2016. This is a matter of record. The necessary documents substantiating this stand have also been placed on record.

In view of the narration as noted above, it is clear that the prayers made in the present petition have been answered. The petition is accordingly rendered infructuous.

Petition disposed of in the above terms.

C.M. No.36491/2016 (Amendment of the writ petition)

This application has been filed by the petitioner subsequently seeking an amendment to the present writ petition. By way of this amendment, the petitioner seeks permission to amend the writ petition and to seek compensation for the physical harassment that she has suffered. The averments in the application disclose that these submissions would require evidence as the petitioner is relying upon documents and other disputed questions (she was denied entry on 25.09.2016 which has been disputed by the respondent) for which evidence may be required.

Thus, this Court is of the view that no purpose would be served in keeping this application pending as the Writ Court would not be able to answer disputed questions of fact for which purpose, this would not be the appropriate forum.

This application is accordingly dismissed.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

OCTOBER 05, 2016

A