

\$~17

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

+ **W.P.(C) 6257/2018 and CM APPL. 24137/2018**

KIRAN DHARAM VATI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr R.K. Saini, Mr Amit Saxena, Mr
Puneet Verma, Mr Kiran Dharam and
Ms Bhawna, Advocates.

versus

LAWYERS CHAMBERS ALLOTMENT
COMMITTEE AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Sanjay Dewan, Ms Nishima Arora
and Ms Shivani Pruthi, Advocates for
R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **05.08.2019**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the minutes of meetings of the Lawyers Chamber Allotment Committee held on 05.09.2017 and 27.11.2017. In terms of the said minutes, the petitioner's representation against non-consideration for allotment of a chamber, has been rejected.

2. The petitioner's principal grievance was that she was not provided an opportunity to establish that she fulfilled the eligibility criteria for allotment of a lawyer's chamber. The said contention was examined by this Court on 19.07.2019 and the following order was passed:

"1. The principal grievance of the petitioner is that she has not been allotted a lawyer's chamber at the Saket Court Complex, despite being eligible for one. Her application for a

lawyer's chamber was rejected as she had not provided the requisite documents to establish that she met the eligibility criteria.

2. She contends that no information regarding any defect in her application for a Lawyer's chamber was informed to her and she was provided no opportunity to cure the defects. On the contrary, the petitioner was led to believe that her application was in order.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has referred to a list published on 26.05.2014 which bears the names of the petitioner and there are no defects mentioned against her name. He also pointed out that there were several persons whose applications were found to be defective and such defects were mentioned against their names in the aforementioned list.

4. He also submits that such persons were given an opportunity to cure the defects and resubmit the requisite documents. This opportunity was denied to the petitioner since she was not informed of any defect in her application, either separately or in the list published by respondent no. 1. The petitioner rests her case on her right to be treated on parity with other applicants. She seeks that a similar opportunity to cure the defects, as provided to other applicants, be also provided to her.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents seeks time to take instructions in this regard.

6. List on 05.08.2019."

3. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents states that the matter has been re-examined and the petitioner's grievance that she was not granted an opportunity, is merited. She states that the petitioner's application would be considered afresh on the basis of the documents filed in this Court for allotment of chamber on multiple occupancy basis.

4. In this view, the petitioner is directed to file with the respondents, a certified copy of the documents relied upon by her, which have been filed in this Court. The respondents shall consider the petitioner's representation afresh for allotment of a lawyer's chamber on multiple occupancy basis. This is so, because the chambers on dual occupancy basis are no longer available. In this regard, it is clarified that as and when a chamber on dual occupancy falls vacant, the petitioner's case would be considered for such allotment on her own seniority.

5. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. The pending application is also disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

AUGUST 05, 2019
RK