



\$~54

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1450/2025**

NASIB SINGH BHAT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Jitender Singh, Advocate.
versus

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

02.02.2026

1. The present petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

“a) Issue writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondents to allot the chamber to the petitioner, in Saket Lawyers Chamber Block, New Delhi as per Seniority and eligibility.

b) Issue writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondents thereby quashing the order dated 30.4.2024 issued by the respondents.

c) Pass any other or further order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper, in the interest of justice.”

2. A bare perusal of the Impugned Order dated 30.04.2024 would indicate that—*first*, the petitioner *vide* an earlier MoM dated 18.05.2012 was found to not be primarily practicing at the Patiala House Courts and hence was found ineligible to be allotted a chamber in the Saket Lawyers Chamber Block, New Delhi; *second*, the representation to the Lawyers Chamber Allotment Committee was made after a period of 11 years; *third*, the MoM



dated 18.05.2012 was published on the official website of the Delhi Districts Courts and the petitioner's contention of it being unaware of the said MoM is not tenable; and *fourth*, even in the personal hearing offered to the petitioner by administrative civil judges, the petitioner has not been able to justify the reason for the 11 year delay. The material portion of the Impugned Order reads as under:

*"To
Sh. Nasib Singh Bhat, Advocate
R/o 224, 1st Floor, Humayunpur,
Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi-110029*

Sub: Representation for allotment of chamber on seniority basis.

Sir,

As per directions, I have to inform you that your representation on the above captioned subject was considered in the meeting of Lawyers Chamber Allotment Committee held on 04.04.2024 at Agenda Item No. 11 and it was resolved as under:-

"On the recommendations of Sub-committee vide its report dated 16.01.2024, personal hearing was given to the applicant, Sh. N.S. Bhat, Advocate, by both the Administrative Civil Judges.

In their report, the documents were stated to be re-examined & scrutinized. It is observed by the ACJ(s) that vide MoM dated 18.05.2012, it was decided by the LCAC that the applicant is not primarily practicing at PHC, hence, he was found ineligible. He was excluded from list C1 and was treated as part of list C2 of ineligible applicants. Present representation has been made after a period of more than 11 years. The applicant has submitted that the result vide MoM dated 18.05.2012 was not communicated to him and therefore, he did not file his representation earlier. Office report has been called in this respect. As per report, all the Minutes of Meetings, lists, notices, etc. are invariably published on official website of Delhi District Courts and copy of same is communicated to Saket Bar Association for information of its members.

Both the ACJ(s) have opined that no ground has been shown in the personal hearing of the applicant to condone the delay of around 11 years.

In view of the above, it is unanimously resolved to reject the representation of Sh. N.S. Bhat, Advocate."



Above is for your information.”

3. The Impugned Order is reasoned, speaking, and has been passed after taking into account the hearing offered to the petitioner before the administrative civil judges. No case is made out of perversity, non-application of mind, or violation of the principles of natural justice. The Court under Article 226 of the Constitution is not to sit in appeal of administrative decisions; and cannot, in any case, substitute its own views with that of the administrative body.

4. Considering the facts and situations of the present case, the Court does not find any reason to interfere with the Impugned Order. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 2, 2026

Nc/ksr