

[122] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-27892-2023

Date of Decision :12.12.2023

Ashok Siwach

...Petitioner

versus

Bar Council of India and others

....Respondents

Coram : **Hon'ble Mr. Justice G.S. Sandhwalia**
Hon'ble Ms. Justice Lapita Banerji

Present : Mr. Abhimanu Jangra, Advocate for the petitioner and
(petitioner-Ashok Siwach appearing in person.)

Ms. Seema, Advocate and Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Mr. S.P. Arora, Advocate for respondent Nos.3.

G.S. SANDHAWALIA, J. (ORAL)

[1] The petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 30.11.2023
(Annexure P-8) passed by respondent No.2 whereby objections raised by
the petitioner has been rejected allegedly in violation of Election Schedule
Rules.

[2] The counsel has sought to bring to our notice that there is
issue of bulk payments of 39 candidates while referring to Annexure P-9
to show that deposits were made by M/s Neft Iserveu Technology Private
Limited on 31.10.2023 in the account of the Bar Association, Meham.

[3] Notice of motion.

[4] Ms. Seema, Advocate and Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate,
accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2, while Mr. S.P. Arora,
Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.3.

It has brought to our notice that the petitioner apparently on

an earlier occasion had been debarred as such for the membership of the Bar Association, Meham on 15.03.2019. His appeal was allowed on 05.11.2022 and he was directed to be treated as a regular member with all facilities/rights in service.

[6] Learned counsel for the petitioner also conceded that in Meham, there are around 127 members and it also been brought to our notice that 05 candidates are for the post of Presidents whereas for the post of Secretary, there are 03 as per the details given by the Election Officer. It is also been brought to our notice that against the order impugned dated 30.11.2023 proceedings are already pending before the Bar Council of India (Annexure P-10).

[7] Keeping in view that the election has already been fixed for 15.12.2023 and the fact that 54 voters against whom the grouse has been raised are not even impleaded as private respondents, we do not see that any direction can be issued at this belated stage. Resultantly, we do not consider it to be a fit case to exercise the extraordinary jurisdiction.

[8] This writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

(LAPITA BANERJI)
JUDGE

12.12.2023
'Rajneesh'