

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

C.R.P. No.2349 of 2018

ORDER:

Heard Mr.N.Pramod, counsel for petitioner.

The revision is directed against un-numbered I.A. filed by revision petitioner under Order III Rule 4 of Civil Procedure Code seeking permission to change the counsel on record in the Court below.

The trial court rejected the request of the petitioner and issued a direction that N.Laxman Rao, advocate is directed to represent the matter before the Court within 30 days, from the date of its order, failing which the petitioner will be at liberty to engage another counsel of his choice.

Though Mr.Srinivas Rao Putluri raised several contentions including the authority of trial Judge to direct Mr.N.Laxman Rao to appear for the petitioner. According to him, the rejection of prayer to engage another advocate suffers from failure to exercise the jurisdiction conferred on the trial Court and further direction issued to continue to engage the advocate who is sought to be substituted is beyond the jurisdiction of trial Court. According to him, the relationship between client and counsel is well defined and the Court has no role to play in this.


Mr.Ravinder Reddy submits that the advocate in the Court below is not interested in continuing to appear for revision petitioner and he is also prepared to give no objection.

Mr.Srinivasa Rao Putluri submits that as an affidavit is filed, the same may be accepted without any formality to obtain No Objection Certificate. The deliberation of this issue can go that far and not beyond.

Civil Revision Petition is allowed and the affidavit filed by the revision petitioner under Order III Rule 4(2) of CPC is accepted and given liberty to engage the advocate of her choice. No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending, shall stand closed.

Dt: 20.04.2018
dv



S. V. BHATT, J

