



W.P.(MD)No.21957 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 12.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

W.P.(MD)No.21957 of 2025

K.B.Venkatesh

... Petitioner

-Vs-

**1.The Secretary,
The Bar Council of Tamil Nadu and Puducherry,
Madras High Court Buildings,
Chennai-104.**

2.M.Stalin Mani

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 24.07.2025 addressed to the 1st respondent for enquiry into his complaint dated 12.07.2024 against the 2nd respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Jainab

For R1 : Mr.Niranjan S.Kumar



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.21957 of 2025

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.**)

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent.

2.This Writ Petition has been instituted, seeking for a direction to the 1st respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 24.07.2025.

3.It is the grievance of the petitioner that the 2nd respondent Advocate was engaged in respect of securing bail for the petitioner. It is the complaint of the petitioner that in the course of securing bail, the 2nd respondent Advocate had committed misconduct. In this regard, the petitioner made a complaint to the 1st respondent. The said complaint was enquired into in Complaint No.334/2024 and detailed resolution dated 23.01.2025 had been passed, wherein the 1st respondent, on considering the complaint, had dropped the complaint, since no *prima facie* case has been made out.



W.P.(MD)No.21957 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. When already the complaint of the petitioner has been taken cognizance and the 1st respondent has enquired into the complaint and by resolution dated 23.01.2025, had dropped the complaint, holding that *prima facie* case has not been made out, the present Writ Petition, seeking for a direction to consider the representation of the petitioner, is not maintainable. If at all the petitioner is aggrieved, he has a remedy available to file an appropriate appeal before the Bar Council of India under Section 37 of the Advocates Act, 1961. Therefore, leaving it open to the petitioner to workout his remedy, this Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

(S.M.S., J.) & (G.A.M., J.)
12.08.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No

Yuva



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.21957 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

AND

G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.

Yuva

W.P.(MD)No.21957 of 2025

12.08.2025