

\$~13 & 14

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

+ W.P.(C) 853/2018

RAVI LOMOD Petitioner

Through: Mr S.C. Sagar, Advocate.

versus

LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT

COMMITTEE & ORS Respondents

Through: Mr Sanjay Dewan and Ms Nishima
Arora, Advocates.

AND

+ W.P.(C) 865/2018

CHUMAN MANDAL Petitioner

Through: Mr S.C. Sagar, Advocate.

versus

LAWYERS' CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT

COMMITTEE & ORS Respondents

Through: Mr Sanjay Dewan and Ms Nishima
Arora, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **28.03.2019**

1. The petitioners have filed the present petitions, *inter alia*, impugning the decisions of respondent no.1, whereby the petitioners' representation for being considered for allotment of a chamber at the Saket Court Complex, was rejected. By a communication dated 19.12.2017, the petitioner in W.P. (C) 853/2018 was informed that his representation was considered by the respondent at a meeting held on 27.11.2017 and the same was rejected. Similarly, the petitioner in W.P. (C) 865/2018 was informed by a communication dated 12.12.2017 that at a meeting held on 27.11.2017, the respondent no. 1 had unanimously

resolved that he did not fulfil the eligibility criteria as per the norms set by respondent no.1.

2. The petitioners are, essentially, aggrieved by the non-allotment of chambers by respondent no.1 (Lawyers Chambers Allotment Committee).

3. The petitioners had applied for allotment of lawyers chamber in the year 2014. Admittedly, in terms of the relevant criteria as adopted by the Sub-committee for allotment of chambers to only those lawyers who were practicing in the Saket Court Complex, were eligible for making the application. In order for providing objective criteria, the applicants were called upon to provide details of their appearances in at least fifteen cases in order to substantiate that they met the eligibility condition of being a regularly practicing lawyer in courts at the Saket Court Complex.

4. However, it was found that in many cases, the names of advocates were not mentioned in the order sheets. In the aforesaid circumstances, respondent no.1 decided to accept certified copies of *vakalatnamas* as evidence of the representation of the applicant in that case. This is also resulted in further complication since in several other cases, *vakalatnamas* were signed by multiple lawyers and this was not sufficient to establish that the applicant – who was only one of the signatories to the *vakalatnama* – was the main counsel who had appeared in the matter.

5. The petitioner in W.P.(C) 853/2018 filed documents pertaining to 3 cases and 14 *vakaltnamas*. The petitioner in W.P. (C) 865/2018 had filed documents pertaining to 7 cases and 11 *valalatnamas*. Admittedly, *vakalatnamas* submitted by the petitioners were signed by other advocates

as well and, therefore, the same were rejected.

6. The principal controversy in these petitions relates to rejection of *vakalatnamas* signed by multiple lawyers as establishing that the applicants (petitioners) were the main counsel in the concerned cases. This issue was considered by this Court in an earlier case in ***Vinod Kumar v. Lawyers Chambers Allotment Committee & Ors.: W.P.(C) 1246/2018*** and ***Dharmendra Singh v. Lawyers Chambers Allotment Committee and Anr.: W.P.(C) 1250/2018***, were decided on 09.02.2018. This Court had after examining the relevant criteria, come to the conclusion that there was no infirmity with the decision of the respondents to reject *vakalatnamas* that were signed by multiple lawyers. It was also noticed that the said criteria has been uniformly applied.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in this case states that there were several other instances where *vakalatnamas* signed by multiple lawyers were accepted by the Lawyers Chambers Allotment Committee. He has also drawn the attention of this Court to two such instances. In one of the instances, the applicant in question had submitted a *vakalatnama* which was signed by multiple lawyers but he had also submitted additional documents to establish that he was the main advocate in that case. He had established the same by producing the affidavit filed by the litigant which was identified by the applicant. Similarly, in another case, it was found that the *vakalatnama* was signed by the applicant as well as his sons and daughter. The said documents were explained by the applicant and his explanation was accepted.

8. This Court does not consider it apposite to express any opinion as to the decision taken by the Lawyers Chambers Allotment Committee in those two cases. Even if it is accepted that in the aforementioned instances the Lawyers Chambers Allotment Committee had not followed its earlier criteria and the same had been relaxed, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. This is so because in all other cases, the criteria was uniformly followed and an affirmative order directing respondent no.1 not to follow the stated criteria cannot be issued.

9. The petitioner in W.P.(C) 865/2018 has also now produced certified copies of order sheets to establish that the petitioner was the main counsel in cases in respect of which *vakalatnama* have been submitted. However, the said documents cannot be considered at this belated stage. Admittedly, the said documents were not provided at the initial stage and were not provided even along with the representation made by the petitioner.

10. In view of the above, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned decisions. The petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

MARCH 28, 2019
RK