



2026:DHC:1610



\$~8

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 11302/2021 and CM APPL. 35313/2021, CM APPL. 397/2022, CM APPL. 64707/2023**

Date of Decision: 18.02.2026**IN THE MATTER OF:****VIPUL PANKAJ SANGHI****.....Petitioner**

Through: Mr. Shivanshu kumar, Mr. Prateek
Vaish, Mr. Md Sajid Ansari,
Advocates

versus**NEW DELHI BAR ASSOCIATION & ANR.****.....Respondents**

Through: Ms Archana Kumari, Advocate for
UOI.
Mr. Rashid N. Azam, Advocate for
Impleader.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV****J U D G E M E N T****PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

*"I. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ allowing the application of the Petitioner dated 29.08.2020 for transposing the name of the Petitioner in the records of Respondent No. 1 from being a joint holder to an absolute holder vis-a-vis Chamber No. 39, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi;
OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:AMIT KUMAR
SHARMA
Signing Date:24.02.2026
10:26:08

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ against Respondent No. 1 thereby directing it to act upon / decide the application of the Petitioner dated 29.08.2020 for transposing the name of the Petitioner in the records of Respondent No.1 from being a joint holder to an absolute holder vis-a-vis Chamber No. 39, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi;”

2. The petitioner is a practising advocate enrolled with Bar Council of Delhi and is member of New Delhi Bar Association (respondent No-1), Patiala House Courts. Respondent no. 2 is Office of District & Session Judge, Patiala House Courts.
3. Petitioner submits that Chamber No. 39, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi (*hereinafter* “Chamber”) was originally allotted to Late Shri M.C. Sanghi, Advocate and *vide* certificate dated 14.09.2010 issued by respondent no.1 the petitioner was recognised as joint holder of the Chamber along with Late Shri M.C. Sanghi.
4. On 20.07.2020 Late Shri M.C. Sanghi expired. Pursuant, thereto, petitioner submitted an application dated 29.08.2020 to respondent no.1 seeking transposition of his status from joint holder to absolute holder of the Chamber.
5. It is the case of the petitioner that despite submission of the application and subsequent reminders dated 27.11.2020 and 02.09.2021, respondent no. 1 failed to take any action. Aggrieved by the same petitioner made a representation dated 12.02.2021 to respondent no. 2, seeking redressal of his grievance. However, no action has been taken.
6. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is the grandson of Mr. M. C. Sanghi and for the same reasons he is entitled for transposition of the Chamber in his name as an independent allottee.
7. The petitioner has also brought on record the extract of the relevant



rules, namely, the Memorandum of Rules and Constitution of the New Delhi Bar Council Association (Amendment), 2018 (*hereinafter* ‘the Rules of 2018’). Rule 21 thereof, would indicate that the allotment of the Chamber shall terminate on the following occurrences.

*“21 The allotment shall terminate;
a.. On its cancellation by Disciplinary Committee; or
b. On its surrender by the allottee concerned; or
c. On the allottee's ceasing to be a member of the Bar Association; or
d. On the allottee's name being removed from the roll of the Bar Council of Delhi; or
e. On death of the allottee.*

Provided that in case of death of an allottee, the Allotment Committee may in its discretion allot the chamber to his father/mother/son/daughter/spouse in his/her place, if applicant is otherwise found eligible as per above rules.”

8. If the application dated 29.08.2020 is considered, it would indicate that Chamber was originally allotted to Mr. M. C. Sanghi, Advocate and admittedly, the petitioner does not fall in any of the categories who are entitled for allotment of the Chamber in terms of the Clause ‘e’ of Rule 21 of the Rules of 2018. In view thereof, no mandamus can be issued to the respondent to act contrary to the Rule and to allow the Chamber to the petitioner.

9. So far as the claim of the petitioner that he is the co-allottee, is concerned, the same is not justified by any material.

10. Accordingly, the petition along with pending applications, stands disposed of.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 18, 2026
aks/mj