



W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 12.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
and
THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE**

W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

R.Jim

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The Secretary
Bar Council of Tamil Nadu
and Pudhucherry
High Court Campus
Chennai-600 104

2.Principal District Judge
Combined District Court Complex
Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli-627 002

3.The Secretary
Tirunelveli Bar Association
Combined District Court Complex
Palayamkottai
Tirunelveli-627 002

... Respondents



W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of mandamus directing the first respondent to take cognizance based on representation dated 03.04.2025 and to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the erring office bearers of the third respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Jim
Party-in-Person

For Respondents : Mr.K.R.Laxman for R1
Mr.N.Tamilmani for R2

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.]

The relief sought for in the present writ petition is to direct the first respondent – Bar Council of Tamil Nadu and Puducherry to take cognizance based on the petitioner's representation dated 03.04.2025 and to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the erring office bearers of the third respondent – Bar Association.

2. The petitioner appearing in person could not establish who are all the office bearers illegally and irregularly involved in the affairs of the third respondent – Bar Association. In the absence of any specific complaint



W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

WEB COPY

regarding misconduct or illegality, if any, committed by the office bearers, the Bar Council of Tamil Nadu and Puducherry may not be in a position to initiate appropriate action. It is needless to state that a complaint must be specific.

3. The petitioner appearing in person states that for flimsy reasons, boycotts are announced by the third respondent – Bar Association, thereby causing inconvenience to the public at large and other lawyers, who are all ready and willing to appear before the courts for the benefit of the litigants, who are all longing to secure justice in the court of law. The Honourable Supreme Court of India has time and again reiterated that lawyers cannot indulge in boycotting the courts for flimsy reasons and in such an event, strong actions are directed to be initiated by the competent authorities. That apart, boycotts may not be a proper solution. Legal profession is a noble profession. Lawyers are not the employees or workmen. They are professionals and bound to protect the interest of the litigants and the majesty of the courts. Thus, boycotting the courts frequently on flimsy reasons or based on certain individual grievances of any lawyer at no circumstance be appreciated, but the same is to be deprecated. Only in the event of any common cause, the lawyer has to approach the Bar Council or the competent



W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

WEB COPY

authorities for the purpose of redressal of their grievance. Contrarily, they are not expected to resort to boycott unnecessarily, thereby obstructing the court proceedings.

4. Lawyers are officers of the court. They are stakeholders in the justice delivery system. Their absence will affect the court proceedings. Courts would not be in a position to hear and dispose of the cases in the absence of the lawyers. Their assistance to the court is of paramount importance in the justice delivery system. Thus, boycotts by the lawyers on flimsy reasons are undoubtedly a concern to the judiciary and this exactly is the reason why the Honourable Supreme Court of India time and again in numerous judgments reiterated that lawyers have to resolve their grievances by approaching the competent forums or the authorities, than resorting to boycotts.

5. As far as the present writ petition is concerned, the petitioner states that he is willing to give a specific complaint against the lawyers, who are all indulged in such illegal activities or misconduct, to the first respondent – Bar Council of Tamil Nadu and Puducherry. In the event of receiving any



W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

WEB COPY

specific complaint from the petitioner against the office bearers of the third respondent – Bar Association or any practicing lawyers, the first respondent is directed to initiate all appropriate actions, as contemplated under the Advocates Act, 1961 and the Rules framed thereunder, including the Bar Council of India Rules.

6. Granting such liberty to the petitioner, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[S.M.S., J.]

[A.D.M.C., J.]

12.06.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

krk

To:
The Principal District Judge,
Combined District Court Complex,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli-627 002.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
DR.A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

krk

W.P.(MD) No.11182 of 2025

12.06.2025

Page 6 of 6