

2025:PHHC:129185-DB



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CM-248-CWPIL-2025 and
CM-249-CWPIL-2025 in/and
CWP-PIL-123-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 17.09.2025

Tushar Tanwar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Bar Council of India

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present: Mr. Tushar Tanwar, petitioner-in-person.

Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, Advocate,
for the respondent.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

CM-248-CWPIL-2025

The present misc. application (CM-248-CWPIL-2025)
has been filed by the applicant-petitioner for fixing an actual
date of hearing in the main petition.

For the reasons set out in the application, same is
allowed and the main petition i.e. CWP-PIL-123-2025 is taken
up today itself.

CM-249-CWPIL-2025

Annexure P-13 is taken on record.

Misc. application stands allowed accordingly.

CWP-PIL-123-2025 (O&M)

1. The present petition was filed by the petitioner, who is
a practicing Lawyer, assailing the action of the Bar Council of

India in charging All India Bar Examination fee under the All India Bar Examination Rules, 2010.

2. The attention has been drawn to an order recently passed by the Apex Court on 02.09.2025 in **Sanyam Gandhi vs. Union of India & another**, Writ Petition (Civil) No.288 of 2025), which reads thus:

1. Application seeking permission to appear and argue-in-person is allowed.

2. Heard Mr. Sanyam Gandhi, the petitioner appearing in-person & Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar, the learned Senior counsel appearing for the Bar Council of India.

3. The subject matter of challenge in the present Writ Petition is the fee being charged by the Bar Council of India for the purpose of conducting the All India Bar Examination to the tune of Rs.3,500/- from the General/OBC candidates and Rs.2500/- and other incidental charges from the SC/ST candidates. This charging of the fees, according to the petitioner, violates Section 24 (1) (f) of the Advocates Act, 1961 and also infringes Articles 19 (1) (g) and 14 respectively of the Constitution of India.

4. He would submit that the Bar Council cannot charge such fees in light of the decision rendered by this Court in the case of "Gaurav Kumar vs. Union of India."

5. We may only say that the decision in the case of Gaurav Kumar would apply in so far as the enrollment fees are concerned. Here is a case where the issue is with regard to charging of fees for the conduct of the All India Bar Examination. The petitioner should understand that the Bar Council of India would incur huge expenses for the purpose of conducting of such examination and if they are charging Rs.3500/- and Rs.2500/- respectively, as referred to above, it cannot be termed as violative of any of the provisions of the Constitution of India or any of the provisions of the Advocates Act.

6. In view of the above, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

7. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.”

3. In view of the above, the impugned decision of the Bar Council of India charging All India Bar Examination fee of Rs.3500/- from the unreserved candidates and Rs.2500/- from reserved category candidates, has been upheld.

4. In view of the above, nothing remains to be adjudicated in this petition and the same stands dismissed as having rendered infructuous.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

September 17, 2025
Ajay Prasher

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No