

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO.761 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.12048 OF 2025**

Santosh s/o Uttamrao UpareApplicant

Versus

Hon'ble Chief General Manager HRD
Dept. & Ors.Respondents

Mr. Santosh Uttamrao Upare (Applicant), party-in-person, present in Court.

Mr. Ashok D. Shetty, Advocate for the Respondents.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.
DATE : 2nd FEBRUARY, 2026**

P.C. :-

1. On 10th November, 2025, we have recorded in Paragraph No.1 of our order that the Committee of the learned Registrars (who are Judicial Officers), has tendered a report dated 26th September, 2025, concluding that the overall capability of the Petitioner has been ascertained and that he should not be granted permission to appear before the Court in person. He would not be able to assist the Court.

2. Despite the above, we permitted him to appear before us in person, which we have recorded in Paragraph No.2. We had struck a note of caution to the Petitioner that he should conduct himself properly, in Paragraph No.3 of the order, which reads as under :

“3. On the condition that the Petitioner would conduct himself in accordance with court manners and etiquette and maintain the dignity and decorum of the Court, as well as, of the lawyers appearing on behalf of the Respondents, we are permitting him to address the Court. We clarify that if there is a single instance of misbehaviour in the Court or the Petitioner acts discourteously in relations to the colleague advocates or the Court, we would restrain his appearance, thereafter.”

3. After hearing the Petitioner for quite some time, we assessed his case *prima facie* on its merits and admitted the Petition by refusing interim relief, and when we passed the order dated 10th November, 2025.

4. Today, the Petitioner has tendered an Interim Application, challenging the Vakalatnama of learned Advocate Mr.

Ashok D. Shetty and Advocate Ms. Rita K. Joshi, who have appeared on behalf of Respondent Nos.1 to 9. It is further prayed that these lawyers should not be allowed to appear in the matter and action should be taken. We find that none of these Respondents have complained before us, either through any other lawyer or for making a grievance that the said learned Advocates have not been authorized to appear on their behalf.

5. We had permitted the Petitioner to appear in person by cautioning him that he should watch his conduct. Noticing that he has now started questioning the Vakalatnama of the Respondent Advocates, we find that this is not only discourteous, but unethical.

6. In view of the above, we withdraw the permission granted to the Petitioner to appear in person, and the request to appear in person stands cancelled. The Petitioner is at liberty to engage an Advocate to appear on his behalf in these matters.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)