

\$~42

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

+ W.P.(C) 4169/2019

SURAT SINGH YADAV

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms Sarika Jetley Kochar, Advocate.

versus

LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT COMMITTEE
AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Sanjay Dewan, Advocate for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **23.04.2019**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that directions be issued to the respondents to allot a suitable chamber to the petitioner, according to his seniority. The petitioner is, essentially, aggrieved by the rejection of his application for the allotment of a lawyers' chamber at Saket Court Complex.
2. It is seen that the petitioner had made a representation in this regard, which was rejected by respondent no.1 by a communication dated 19.12.2017. Aggrieved by the said decision, the petitioner had filed a writ petition – W.P.(C) 9460/2018 captioned '*Surat Singh Yadav v. Lawyers' Chambers Allotment Committee & Anr.*' The said petition was disposed of by an order dated 10.09.2018. This Court had taken note of the eligibility criteria for the allotment of a chamber, and had further observed that it appeared that the petitioner did not qualify the said eligibility criteria. At

that stage, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner had insisted that the petitioner did qualify the criteria and the same was clearly established by the documents provided to respondent no.1 at the material time. The said contention could not be considered as the petitioner was unable to produce the copies of the relevant orders or vakalatnama that were furnished, alongwith his application for the allotment of a lawyer's chamber.

3. It was contended on behalf of the petitioner that the copies of those documents were not available with the petitioner, and in this context this Court had disposed of the petition, by observing that the petitioner would be at liberty to approach the concerned Allotment Committee for seeking copies of the documents furnished by him at the time of the application. The petitioner was also granted opportunity to approach this Court after he had obtained the copies of the documents that were filed at the material time, along with his application.

4. Although, the petitioner has filed several documents alongwith this petition in support of his contention that he complied with the eligibility criteria, it is admitted that the said documents are not the ones that were supplied by the petitioner alongwith his application. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner fairly states that the petitioner's request for copies of the documents supplied along with his application is still pending consideration before respondent no.1.

5. It is clear that the question whether the petitioner had fulfilled the eligibility criteria is required to be examined on the basis of the documents furnished by the petitioner alongwith his application and not the documents that the petitioner had filed, subsequently. In the aforesaid view, this court finds no ground to entertain the present petition. The same is, accordingly,

dismissed. It is, however, clarified that the opportunity granted to the petitioner by the order dated 10.09.2018 passed in W.P.(C) 9460/2018, is still available to the petitioner.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

APRIL 23, 2019
MK