

\$~2

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8265/2017 & CM APPL. 34016-34017/2017**

PARIKSHIT MAHIPAL Petitioner

Through: Petitioner-in-person.

versus

**THE LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT COMMITTEE
& ORS** Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Dewan with Ms. Palak
Rohmetra, Advs for R1

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

% **24.05.2018**

1. This is a writ petition, whereby, challenge is laid to the communication dated 11.07.2017, addressed by the Lawyers' Chambers Allotment Committee (in short 'Committee') to the petitioner.

2. By virtue of the impugned communication, the petitioner's application for being allotted a chamber in the Rohini Courts Complex has been rejected.

3. Briefly, the reason given in the impugned communication is that the petitioner has been able to furnish 4 vakalatnamas only and established that he has made 38 appearances in the Rohini District Courts which is not in consonance with the eligibility criteria put in place for the purpose of chamber allotment.

4. It is not disputed before me by counsel for the parties that the minimum requirement for being allotted a chamber is that the applicant had to have at least 50 court appearances between 02.01.2006 and 28.02.2013. Besides this, the applicant was also required to submit details of at least 10 cases/proceedings in which he or she had filed vakalatnama as main counsel in any of the courts located in the Rohini Courts Complex, till 28.02.2013.

5. A perusal of the impugned order would show that according to the committee, the petitioner fell below the minimum requirement stipulated, for being eligible for allotment of a chamber.

6. The petitioner, however, contests the finding reached by the Committee and says that it has failed to carefully examine his representation dated 08.03.2017. It is the submission of the petitioner that the said representation was accompanied by certified copies of the Goshwara register for the period spanning from January 2012 to May 2012, and other relevant details which were over looked by the Committee.

7. It is, therefore, the submission of the petitioner that if the documents filed with the representation were taken into account, then the Committee would have reached a conclusion that the petitioner had, in fact, fulfilled the eligibility criteria; an aspect to which, I have made a reference above.

8. As indicated above, the impugned order does not dilate upon this aspect of the matter, that is, whether or not the material filed by the petitioner along with his representation was examined by the

Committee.

9. In these circumstances, I am inclined to set aside the impugned communication dated 11.07.2017.

9.1 It is ordered accordingly.

10. The committee will revisit the issue and examine the documents filed along with the petitioner's representation dated 08.03.2017.

10.1 For this purpose, the Committee will grant a personal hearing to the petitioner.

10.2 Needless to say, the aforesaid exercise will be completed by the Committee with due expedition.

11. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

12. Pending applications shall stand closed.

13. *Dasti.*

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 24, 2018

c