

\$~55

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

+ W.P.(C) 9460/2018 & CM No. 36733/2018

SURAT SINGH YADAV

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr S. C. Sagar, Advocate.

versus

LAWYERS' CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT
COMMITTEE & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Amit Mahajan, CGSC UOI with
Ms Mallika Hiremath, Advocates for
R-1 to R-3.

Mr H. S. Parihar and Mr Kuldeep S.
Parihar, Advocates for RBI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **10.09.2018**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition impugning a communication dated 19.12.2017, whereby the decision of the Lawyers' Chamber Allotment Committee to reject the petitioner's representation has been communicated. The Lawyers' Chamber Allotment Committee had held a meeting on 27.11.2017 and recorded that the sub-committee for allotment of chambers at Saket Court Complex had found that none of the applicants had filed certified copies of 15 cases as required (which was the criteria to be met), thereafter, the Committee had considered certified copies of *vakalatnama(s)* reflecting single signature of the lawyer as sufficient evidence to establish that the advocate (in whose favour the *vakalatnama* was executed) had acted in the case in question.

2. In terms of the relevant criteria for allotment of chambers, the applicant had to establish that he is a regular practitioner in the Saket Court Complex (South and South East District Courts). In order to establish the same, the applicant was required to provide documents to establish that he had appeared/acted in at least fifteen cases. In order to do so, the applicant was required to produce order sheets reflecting his appearance. Since in some case the names of the advocates were not mentioned in the order sheets, the Allotment Committee considered it apposite to also accept *vakalatnamas* in the name of the individual advocate as sufficient material to establish that he was the counsel engaged in the particular case. This Court in a number of decisions held that the said criteria cannot be faulted.

3. It appears from the impugned communication that the petitioner did not qualify the aforesaid eligibility criteria. Mr Sagar, learned counsel for the petitioner, nonetheless, states that he did qualify the said criteria and the documents provided to the Lawyers' Chamber Allotment Committee established the same. But, he is unable to establish the same as the copies of the relevant order sheets or *vakalatnamas* furnished along with the application for allotment of a chamber have not been filed.

4. Mr Sagar states that the copies of the said documents are now not available with the petitioner. In this view, no relief can be granted to the petitioner at this stage. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach the concerned Allotment Committee for seeking copies of the documents supplied by him.

5. The petition is, accordingly, disposed of leaving it open for the petitioner to file afresh after the petitioner has obtained copies of the

documents filed along with his application. The pending application is also disposed of.

6. Order *dasti*.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

SEPTEMBER 10, 2018
MK