

\$~19

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

+ W.P.(C) 366/2018 & CM No. 1538/2018

SHRI AJAY KUMAR Petitioner

Through: Mr Ajay Kumar, Advocate.

versus

THE LAWYER'S CHAMBER ALLOTMENT
COMMITTEE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Sanjay Dewan, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **20.08.2018**

1. The petitioner – a practicing advocate – has filed the present petition, essentially, being aggrieved by non allotment of lawyer's chamber at Saket Court Complex.
2. In terms of the relevant criteria fixed for allotment, the petitioner was required to establish that he was a regular practitioner in the said Court Complex by giving details of 15 cases handled by him. There is no dispute that the petitioner has given the details of 15 separate cases. However, the petitioner has been considered ineligible for allotment on the ground that five of the cases referred to by the petitioner relate to the same FIR.
3. The Allotment Committee while considering his representation had considered two cases – namely *Baby Aseefa (Minor) v. Shri Deepak Kumar & Ors.* and *Md. Sayeed (Minor) v. Deepak Kumar & Ors.* – as one case. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent states that this was so

considered because both the minor children were represented through their father. It is, however, pointed out that Baby Aseefa (Minor) and Md. Sayeed (Minor) are not siblings. They had filed the cases through their respective fathers, therefore, the premise on which these two cases have been considered as one is, apparently, erroneous.

4. It is also submitted that case no.5/13 captioned as *Md. Iliyas v. Deepak Kumar & Ors.* and case no.7/12 captioned as *Mohd. Iliyas & Ors. v. Shri Deepak Kumar & Ors.* were also considered as one case. However, it is seen that the petitioners in both the cases are not identical. Case no.7/12 has more than one petitioner whereas case no.5/13 has only one petitioner (Md. Iliyas).

5. The petition is disposed of by remanding the matter to the Allotment Committee to consider the petitioner's representation afresh in the light of observations made herein above. The pending application is also disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

AUGUST 20, 2018
MK