



\$~47

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 3415/2025 & CM APPL. 16095/2025**

**SANJEEV KUMAR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Adv. (Petitioner in person) with Mr. Vasu Baisoya, Mr. Sushant Jain and Mr. Ashish Kumar Sharma, Advs.

versus

**BAR COUNCIL OF DELHI**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. T. Sighdev, Mr. Tanishq Srivastava, Ms. Yamini Singh, Mr. Abhijit Chakravarty and Mr. Sourav Kumar, Advs.

M: 9999012345

Mr. Piyush Beriwal, Mr. Nikhil Kumar Choubey, Ms. Disha Choudhary, Mr. Sandip and Ms. Jyotika Vyas, Advs.

M: 9910396352

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA**

**ORDER**

**19.03.2025**

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for direction to the respondent, i.e., Bar Council of Delhi, for framing Rules and Regulations, pertaining to the nomination fees to be deposited by intending candidates for contesting in the Bar Elections of various Courts.

2. The petitioner, who appears in person, submits that he is a practicing



advocate and has been practicing for the last 18 years. He submits that he is a member of Central District Bar Association (“CDBA”), Rouse Avenue Court, having voting right therein. The petitioner is aggrieved by the notification/notice issued by the Election Committee dated 14<sup>th</sup> February, 2025.

3. The petitioner, appearing in person, submits that the petitioner wanted to contest the elections that are being held for various posts of CDBA, Rouse Avenue, but could not file his nomination due to excessive nomination fee. Thus, the present writ petition has been filed.

4. The petitioner submits that different associations in various Courts in Delhi, have different fee structure with respect to the nomination fee, which is required to be deposited by the candidates for contesting elections of the Bar.

5. The petitioner further submits that the New Delhi Bar Association has nomination fees of Rs. 10,000/-, whereas, CDBA, Rouse Avenue has nomination fees of Rs. 75,000/-, which is excessive.

6. He submits that the parent body of the CDBA, Rouse Avenue, is the New Delhi Bar Association, as the matters are being transferred from Patiala House Court, to Rouse Avenue.

7. This Court notes that the elections in the Rouse Avenue, are slated for day after tomorrow, i.e., 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2025.

8. This Court notes that only Bar Council of Delhi has been made a party in the present proceedings.

9. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent, Bar Council of Delhi, submits that it is for the respective Bar Associations to frame their own Rules and Regulations, and fix nomination fees for the elections. He submits



that the Bar Council of Delhi does not fix any fees for any bodies, as the said bodies of the Bar Association are private bodies.

10. He further submits that with regards to Rouse Avenue, there is only a *ad hoc* Committee for the time being in terms of the directions of the Division Bench *vide* judgment dated 08<sup>th</sup> April, 2024 in *W.P.(C) 3713/2019*, titled as ***Rouse Avenue Bar Association Versus The Bar Council of Delhi & Anr.***, and other connected matter.

11. He submits that since the CDBA of Rouse Avenue, is a newly constituted body and elections for the same shall be held for the first time, the Division Bench, has constituted an *ad hoc* committee.

12. He further submits that after the elections, which are slated for 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2025, a General Body will be constituted. He, thus, submits that once the office bearers of CDBA, Rouse Avenue, assume their office, the relevant Rules and Regulations shall be formulated by the said body, for the purposes of nomination fee, also.

13. Though, the *ad hoc* committee as constituted by this Court, has not been made a party, a counsel represents the said *ad hoc* committee and submits that the nomination fee, which has been stipulated for the time being, is only an *ad hoc* arrangement and the final decision with respect to the nomination fee for future elections, shall be taken by the regular body after the election.

14. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the parties, this Court notes that the Division Bench *vide* its judgment dated 08<sup>th</sup> April, 2024, in the aforesaid case of *Rouse Avenue Bar Association*, has passed the following directions:

“xxx xxx xxx



65. In view of the above, we direct as under:

i) That the Central Delhi Court Bar Association shall be the recognized Court annexed Bar Association for the Rouse Avenue District Court Complex;

xxx xxx xxx

iii) an Adhoc Committee is hereby constituted for the management of the Central Delhi Court Bar Association comprising of

- (a) Vice President of the Delhi High Court Bar Association
- (b) Senior Vice President of the Delhi Bar Association
- (c) Vice President of the New Delhi Bar Association
- (d) Senior Vice President of the Shahdara Bar Association
- (e) Vice President of the Rohini Bar Association
- (f) Vice President of the Dwarka Court Bar Association
- (g) Vice President of the Saket Bar Association

xxx xxx xxx

vii) The Adhoc committee shall open the membership of the Association to those Advocates who fulfil the eligibility conditions for membership.

xxx xxx xxx

xiii) The Adhoc Committee shall ensure compliance of all the directions issued by the Full Bench by its judgment dated 19.03.2024 in Lalit Sharma (supra) with regard to the conduct of elections and the eligibility criteria for the said election.

xxx xxx xxx”

15. Perusal of the aforesaid order, clearly shows that the Division Bench has constituted an *adhoc* Committee for the management of the CDBA, Rouse Avenue, which comprises of the Vice Presidents and Senior Vice Presidents of various Bar Associations of the Courts in Delhi. It is further to be noted that the said *adhoc* committee has been constituted only as an *adhoc* arrangement.



16. This Court also takes note of the fact that elections for the said association are to be held on 21<sup>st</sup> March, 2025.

17. Accordingly, it is directed that the present writ petition shall be considered as representation by the Executive Committee of the CDBA, Rouse Avenue, after the same is duly constituted, after the elections.

18. At this stage, the petitioner who appears in person, submits that he had made a representation to the Bar Council of Delhi dated 10<sup>th</sup> March, 2025, which is yet to be decided.

19. Accordingly, the Bar Council of Delhi, is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 10<sup>th</sup> March, 2025. If need be, the petitioner may also be called for a personal hearing, before deciding the representation of the petitioner.

20. The representation of the petitioner shall be decided by the General Body of CDBA, Rouse Avenue expeditiously, preferably within four months of constitution of the new body. Likewise, the representation of the petitioner shall be decided by the Bar Council of Delhi, expeditiously, preferably within four months from today.

21. Needless to state, in case the petitioner is aggrieved by any decision with regard to the nomination fee in future, he is at liberty to seek remedies, in accordance with law.

22. With the aforesaid directions, the present petition, along with the pending application, is disposed of.

**MINI PUSHKARNA, J**

**MARCH 19, 2025/kr**