



\$~8

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 2324/2026 and CM APPL. 5124/2020

MR. ASHISH RAJPUT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Saksham Gupta, Advocate

versus

THE CHAMBER ALLOTMENT COMMITTEE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sameer Vashisht, Standing Counsel
for GNCTD

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

29.05.2026

The matter is taken up today as 28.05.2026 was declared a holiday on account of 'Id-ul-Zuha (Bakrid)'.

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner seeks following prayers:-

“A. Issue a writ, order, or direction in the nature of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to reconsider the candidature of the Petitioner for allotment of a Lawyers' Chamber at the Karkardooma Court Complex strictly in accordance with the notification dated 19.09.2025, the governing Rules, and the binding judicial directions of this Hon'ble Court, by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a time-bound period, and consequently to allot a Lawyers' Chamber to the Petitioner at the Karkardooma Court Complex strictly in accordance with the applicable notification, the binding judicial directions governing the list of 113 left-out candidates, and the settled principles of fair and reasonable administrative action, as per the Petitioner's seniority, within such time-bound period as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.

B. Issue a writ, order, or direction quashing and setting aside the impugned rejection letter dated 24.01.2026 issued by the



respondents whereby the Petitioner's candidature for allotment of a Lawyers' Chamber has been rejected on the vague and non-speaking ground of alleged non-fulfilment of eligibility criteria, and consequently direct the Respondents to reconsider the Petitioner's candidature for allotment of a Lawyers' Chamber in accordance with law by passing a reasoned and speaking order within a time-bound period."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's case for chamber allotment has been rejected by a cryptic and unreasoned impugned order. He further submits that, as per the subsequent oral communications, the respondent has informed that the petitioner has not furnished 10 number of *Vakalatnamas* for the relevant period. He further submits that the petitioner has furnished 7 *Vakalatnamas* alongwith 3 receipts seeking certified copies of the remaining *Vakalatnamas*.

3. Mr. Vashisht, learned counsel for the respondent, fairly concedes that that the impugned order is not specifying any reason for rejection of the petitioner's application.

4. A perusal of the impugned order shows that no reasons have been assigned in dismissing the petitioner's application.

5. In the aforesaid circumstances, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to consider the petitioner's application afresh and an appropriate order be passed after hearing the parties. The petitioner shall be at liberty to place on record the remaining 3 *Vakalatnamas*, which shall be considered in accordance with the rules/guidelines.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MAY 29, 2026/na