

\$~37

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

+ W.P.(C) 814/2018

JAYA GOYAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms Manpreet Kaur, Advocate.

versus

LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT

COMMITTEE & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr D. Rajeshwar Rao and Mr Kapil  
Agnihotri, Advocates for R-1.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU**

**ORDER**

% **31.01.2018**

**CM No.3472/2018**

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

**W.P.(C) 814/2018 and CM No. 3471/2018**

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, challenging the minutes of the meeting dated 05.09.2017 and 18.09.2017, whereby the respondents rejected the petitioner's application for allotment of chamber in the Lawyers' Chamber Block, Saket Courts Complex, New Delhi.
4. The principal reason for rejection of the petitioner's application is that the petitioner has not provided information relating to minimum fifteen cases to establish that the petitioner met the eligibility criteria. This is disputed by the petitioner.

5. Mr Rao, the learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1 has provided a tabular statement, which indicates that although the petitioner has provided the details of fifteen cases, the Committee found that the details pertained only to thirteen cases. This was so because four cases were considered as similar and, therefore, counted as only two cases.

6. Two of the cases submitted by the petitioner were amongst the same parties - that is, Ms Shahla Nigar v. Arvinder Ansari: Case No. 645/2010 and Ms Shahla Nigar v. Arvinder Ansari: Case No. 3/2011 - and therefore were considered as a single case.

7. It is seen that one of the aforesaid matter is a suit while the other is an appeal against an order passed in an application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC in the suit. Thus, indisputably, the said matters cannot be considered as two separate cases. However, even if the said cases are considered as two separate cases as urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner still does not qualify the eligibility criteria. It is seen that the petitioner had provided details of two other cases – Case No. 545/6/14 captioned “Sanjay Goel HUF v. Shyam Pal” and Case No. 546/6/14 captioned “Sanjay Goel HUF v. Shyam Pal”. Whilst the order in the case 545/6/14 reflects the presence of the petitioner as a Counsel; the order purporting to be of Case No. 546/6/14 is in fact record of proceedings pertaining to Case No. 545/6/14. It is apparent that this is an inadvertent error; but it is fatal to the petitioner’s application as the petitioner’s presence in case 545/6/14 is not established.

8. There is an order sheet which pertains to Case No. 546/6/14 but that

does not reflect the name of the petitioner.

9. In this view, it is clear that the petitioner does not comply with the eligibility criteria and the decision of the respondents in rejecting the petitioner's application cannot be faulted.

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

**JANUARY 31, 2018**  
**RK**

**VIBHU BAKHRU, J**