



CWP-9883-2024(O&M)

(1)

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

[232]

CWP-9883-2024(O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.02.2026

VIJAY SINGLA

..... PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Karan Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanav Singla, AAG, Punjab, for the respondents.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This writ petition has been filed, *inter alia*, for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to make payment of the professional fee amounting to Rs.6,68,000/- along with interest @ 12% per annum.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner retired as Director, Prosecution and Litigation-Cum-Additional Secretary to Government of Punjab and has been practising as a lawyer since 01.02.2021. He states that petitioner was attached with Special Investigating Team (SIT), vide memo dated 19.05.2021 (Annexure P-1) and rendered legal advice. Counsel points out that by letter 25.06.2021 (Annexure P-2), petitioner dissociated himself from the SIT due to family circumstances. Counsel further points out that the petitioner is entitled to an amount of Rs.6,68,000/- @ Rs.33,000/- per hearing for conferences on 21 different occasions, besides clerkage and miscellaneous expenses. Counsel asserts that a fee bill of (Annexure P-3) was raised, but payment has not been disbursed.

3. Upon notice, writ petition has been contested by the respondents by filing a short reply by way of an affidavit of Assistant



CWP-9883-2024(O&M)

(2)

Inspector General of Police, Litigation, Bureau of Investigation, Punjab, on behalf of respondent No.1. It has been stated that petitioner was associated for providing legal expertise during investigation in FIR No.129 dated 07.08.2018 and FIR No.192 dated 14.10.2015, registered at Police Station City, Kotkapura, District Faridkot. A categorical stand has been taken that no terms and conditions for retainer-ship were settled and no formal agreement was arrived at between the parties. It has been stated that professional fee of Rs.95,000/- was found due and has been disbursed to petitioner for his association with the SIT for a period of 35 days. Professional fee as claimed by petitioner has been disputed.

4. State counsel has opposed the petition by asserting that the writ petition claiming lawyers' fee is not maintainable.

5. Having heard counsel for the parties and considering their submissions, this Court is of the view that there is a substance in the objection raised by the State counsel. In ***Improvement Trust, Ropar Vs. S. Tejinder Singh Gujral and Others, 1995 SUPP (4) SCC 577***, Apex Court has categorically held that no writ petition can lie for recovery of an amount under a contract and there is no separate law for lawyers. Further in ***New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Vs. A.K. Saxena, 2004(1) SCC 117***, Supreme Court has observed that when there is dispute about unpaid remuneration of an Advocate, it is not for the High Court to adjudicate upon such a disputed question of fact. In their response, respondents have specifically denied the claim of the petitioner for professional fee. It is, therefore, evident that there is a dispute over the amount claimed by the petitioner.

6. For the foregoing reasons, this Court is of the view that this petition is not maintainable and is accordingly dismissed. However, liberty is



CWP-9883-2024(O&M)

(3)

given to the petitioner to resort to legal remedies permissible to him under the law.

7. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

24.02.2026
Anjal

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