

\$~27

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 11085/2017

ANURAG PRATAP

..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI

AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Sanjay Dewan and Ms Palak
Rohmetra, Advocates for R-
1/GNCTD.
Mr D. Rajeshwar Rao and Mr
Abhinav Srivastav, Advocates for R-
2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

13.12.2017

CM No. 45331/2017

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 11085/2017 and CM No. 45330/2017

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the minutes of the meeting of the Lawyer's Chamber Allotment Committee, Saket Court dated 27.11.2017.
4. The petitioner is, essentially, aggrieved by the rejection of his application for allotment of a Lawyers' Chamber on the ground that the

petitioner does not meet the criteria of acting as the main counsel in fifteen cases. The aforesaid criteria was adopted to ensure that only persons who have been practising in South and South-East Districts are considered for allotment of Lawyers' Chamber.

5. In order to establish that the petitioner was a regular practitioner in those courts, the petitioner had provided *vakalatnama* in fifteen cases.

6. It was found that five out of the said cases pertain to applications for anticipatory bails filed on behalf of members of one Family (Bisht Family). The Allotment Committee was of the view that the five anticipatory bail applications in relation to the same allegation would not constitute five separate cases.

7. This Court finds no infirmity in the aforesaid view. Filing of five anticipatory bail applications for five different persons admittedly connected in the same case cannot be considered as five different cases.

8. The petition and the application are, accordingly, dismissed.

9. Order *dasti*.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

DECEMBER 13, 2017
RK