



\$~47

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

+ **W.P.(C) 3525/2026**

RAMESH CHANDRA SINGHPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

BAR COUNCIL OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. T. Singhdev, Mr. Tanishq Srivastava, Ms. Yamini Singh, Mr. Abhijit Chakravarty, Mr. Bhanu Gulati, Mr. Saurabh Kumar, Mr. Vedant Sood and Ms. Ramanpreet Kaur, Advocates for R-1/BCD.
Mr. Preet Pal Singh, Ms. Simran Kumari, Ms. Medha Sharma, Mr. Gaurav and Ms. Pooja, Advocates for BCI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

19.03.2026

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to respondent no. 1/Bar Council of Delhi ('BCD'), to clarify that 6 seats in the BCD be categorically reserved for Advocates with less than 10 years of practice.
2. The petitioner, who appears in-person, is a practising Advocate enrolled with Bar Council of Delhi with less than 10 years of standing at the Bar, and is a contestant in the BCD elections held in February, 2026.
3. As per the notification dated 24th December, 2025 issued by the Bar Council of Delhi ('Impugned Notification') for election of 23 members, 12 seats have been reserved for Advocates with at least 10 years of practice as



on 30th November, 2025, and 5 seats have been reserved for women candidates. It is the contention of the petitioner that the remaining 6 seats should be reserved for Advocates with less than 10 years of practice. He submits that non-reservation of seats for Advocates with less than 10 years of practice is a violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

4. Mr. T. Singhdev, counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.1/BCD submits that the present petition suffers from delay and laches as the elections to BCD have already been held and the counting process has begun. He further submits that the Impugned Notification was issued on 24th December, 2015 and the petitioner is challenging the same at this belated stage.

5. I have heard submissions on behalf of the parties.

6. It is an undisputed position that the petitioner was a contestant in the BCD elections that were held in February, 2026. Despite being aware of the Impugned Notification dated 24th December, 2025, in terms of which reservations have been made only for Advocates with more than 10 years of practice and women Advocates, he chose to contest the aforesaid elections without protesting in any manner.

7. Now, the elections have already been conducted and the counting process has begun. At this stage, the petitioner cannot be permitted to challenge the Impugned Notification in terms of which the aforesaid elections were held and in which the petitioner was a candidate.

8. The petitioner relies upon Section 3(2)(b) of the Advocates Act, 1961 in support of his contention that there should be proportional representation for all categories of Advocates. For ease of reference, Section 3(2)(b) of the Advocates Act, 1961, is set out below:



(2) A State Bar Council shall consist of the following members, namely:—

(a) in the case of the State Bar Council of Delhi, the Additional Solicitor-General of India, *ex officio*; ⁸[in the case of the State Bar Councils of Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Nagaland, the Advocate-General of each of the States of Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Nagaland] *ex officio*; in the case of the State Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana, the Advocate-General of each of the States of Punjab and Haryana, *ex officio*;] and in the case of any other State Bar Council, the Advocate-General of the State, *ex officio*;

¹⁰[(b) in the case of a State Bar Council with an electorate not exceeding five thousand, fifteen members, in the case of a State Bar Council with an electorate exceeding five thousand but not exceeding ten thousand, twenty members, and in the case of a State Bar Council with an electorate exceeding ten thousand, twenty-five members, elected in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote from amongst advocates on the electoral roll of the State Bar Council:]

¹¹[Provided that as nearly as possible one-half of such elected members shall, subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf by the Bar Council of India, be persons who have for at least ten years been advocates on a State roll, and in computing the said period of ten years in relation to any such person, there shall be included any period during which the person has been an advocate enrolled under the Indian Bar Councils Act, 1926 (38 of 1926).]

9. The aforesaid proviso to Section 3(2)(b) clearly states that nearly half of the elected members have to be Advocates with more than 10 years of practice. Insofar as reservation has been made for women Advocates, the same has been done pursuant to the order passed by the Supreme Court on 8th December, 2025 in W.P.(C) 581/2024 titled ***Yogamaya M.G. v. Union of India & Ors.***

10. In the aforesaid circumstances, merely because reservation has been made for Advocates with more than 10 years' experience and women Advocates, would not create any vested right in favour of the Advocates with less than 10 years' experience, including the petitioner, to seek reservation.

11. Accordingly, I do not find any merit in the present writ petition and the same is dismissed as not maintainable.

AMIT BANSAL, J

MARCH 19, 2026/Rzu