

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.664 OF 2025**

Avipsit Rath

....Petitioner

Versus

Bar Council of Maharashtra & Goa & Anr.Respondents

Mr. Avipsit Rath, Petitioner in person.

Mr. Yogendra Rajgor for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Prasad L. Gajbhiye for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATE : 9th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :-

1. The Petitioner had engaged an Advocate in Mumbai whose name is mentioned in the memo of the Petition and paid him fees of Rs.2 lakhs. The Civil Writ Petition was withdrawn. Thereafter, the same Advocate filed Criminal Writ Petition No.5704 of 2021, forging the signature of the Petitioner on the Vakalatnama as well as the Petition. The Petitioner has now completed his LLB and is yet to apply for a Sanad. He lodged Disciplinary Complaint No.389 of 2023 on 3rd November, 2023 with the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa. Despite his repeated requests, Respondent

No.1 did not deal with the complaint, is the grievance voiced.

2. The learned Advocate for the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa submits, on instructions, that the complaint was considered, written submissions were tendered and the matter was closed for orders on 29th October, 2024. Since the order was not passed within one year from the date of the complaint, the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa has now transferred the matter to Respondent No.2, the Bar Council of India.

3. The Petitioner, who is present in person, submits that due to the laxity on the part of the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa, he has been compelled to run from pillar to post. He further submits that he was working with Canara Bank in Mumbai and was terminated from service, as a result of which he entered into litigation. According to him, the Advocate engaged by him defrauded him. He, therefore, approached the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa in Mumbai by lodging a disciplinary complaint. He further submits that he will now have to travel from Odisha to Delhi in connection with the said proceedings. He,

therefore, prays that heavy costs be imposed.

4. Since the proceedings have now been transferred to the Bar Council of India, which will be dealing with the complaint of the Petitioner as well as the issue as to why the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa did not decide the complaint within a period of one year, we leave the request of the Petitioner for costs against the Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa, open, to be canvassed before the Bar Council of India. The Bar Council of India shall consider the said request and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law.

5. The learned Advocate for the Bar Council of India fairly joins the Petitioner in submitting that, considering the hardship faced by the Petitioner, a time bound programme may be granted to the Bar Council of India to decide the Petitioner's complaint expeditiously.

6. Since the complaint of the Petitioner has been transferred to the Bar Council of India by the Bar Council of

Maharashtra and Goa last week, and since the Petitioner has already suffered in the above-stated circumstances, we would expect Respondent No.2, Bar Council of India, to decide the Petitioner's complaint within a period of six months from today.

7. With the above directions and observations, **this Petition is disposed off.**

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)