

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.345 of 2023

=====

Court on its own motion on the basis of resolution/complaint passed by
Coordination Committee Honorable Patna High Court.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Home Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Coordination Committee, through its Chairman, Patna High Court, Patna.
5. The State Bar Council, through its Chairman, Patna.
6. Mr. Niranjana (Advocate) Flat No.- 101, Gajadhar Kailash Apartment, Road No.- 02, East Patel Nagar (Near Gandhi Murti), Patna-23. Email-niranjana@law@gmail.com

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr.
For the State	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Mandal (SC-3)
		Ms. Neelam Kumari, AC to SC-3
		Mr. Bipin Kumar, AC to SC-3
For Respondent No. 6	:	Mr. Mrigank Mauli, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 21-04-2023

1. The writ petition was *suo motu* initiated on the grievance projected by all the three Associations of the Patna High Court with respect to misconduct alleged on an advocate of this Court, which was on the allegation of an abuse perpetrated on a trainee in his chambers, outside the premises of the Court. A



complaint was registered by the victim before the police, also before the Internal Complaints Committee and the Bar Council.

2. The students of the college in which the trainee was studying also filed a complaint before Bar Council. The Vice Chancellor of the University also wrote to the Bar Council.

3. The Bar Council hence constituted a three-member disciplinary committee to go into the allegations. The Bar Council of India suspended the advocate against whom allegations were raised.

4. As of now, proceedings are in motion, both disciplinary proceeding, before the Bar Council and the criminal proceedings, as instituted on the complaint of the trainee.

5. The learned senior counsel appearing for the suspended advocate wanted to withdraw the earlier undertaking given by the advocate that he would not enter the premises of the High Court. An application to that effect is also filed.

6. We reject the application, especially since we find that as of now he is suspended from practicing, by the Bar Council of India itself and there is no reason why he should enter the Court premises.

7. Since the other proceedings are pending, subject to such proceedings, the undertaking would continue and the writ



petition, as of now, would stand closed on consent of all parties,
since nothing further can be done in the writ petition.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shashank/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	25.04.2023
Transmission Date	NA

