

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(PIL) No. 1956 of 2021

Bidesh Kumar Dan, Son of Murli Dhara Dan, Age about- 45 Years, Resident of 49 Maniyadih, Tundi, P.S & P.O.-Tundi, District- Dhanbad-828109, Jharkhand.

..... Petitioner

Versus

1. Union of India, Through its Secretary, Ministry of Law And Justice, 4th Floor, A-Wing, Shastri Bhawan, P.O.-Krishi Bhawan, P.S.-Sansad Marg, District and State-New Delhi 110001.
2. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, through its Secretary, Room No. 348; 'A' Wing, Nirman Bhavan, Near Udyog Bhawan Metro Station, Maulana Azad Rd, P.O.-Krishi Bhawan, P.S.-Sansad Marg, District and State-New Delhi 110011.
3. State of Jharkhand, through Chief Secretary, 1st Floor, Project Bhawan, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, Ranchi, Jharkhand-834004.
4. Bar Council of India, through its Secretary, 21 Rouse Avenue Institutional Area ITO, Near Bal Bhawan, P.S. Darya Ganj Police Station, P.O.-ITO, New Delhi-110002.
5. Jharkhand State Bar Council, through its Secretary, Bungalow No. 8, near Kendriya Vidyalay, P.O. & P.S. Doranda, Jharkhand 834002.

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Mr Md Shadab Ansari, Advocate
For the Union of India : Mr Prashant Pallav, ASGI
Mr Radha Krishan Gupta, CGC
For the State : Mr Gaurav Raj, AC to AAG-II
For the BCI : Mr Prashant Kumar Singh, Advocate
Mr Karbir, Advocate
For the JSBC : Mr Manoj Tandon, Advocate
Ms Neha Bhardwaj, Advocate
Mr Siddharth Ranjan, Advocate

30 /Dated: 08.06.2026

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. The petitioner, a practising advocate in the State of Jharkhand, by way of this Public Interest Litigation, seeks the following reliefs:-

“(a) Direction upon the Respondent No.-1 (Ministry of Law and Justice, GOI) and Respondent No.-3 (Government of Jharkhand) to immediately provide financial Aid to Jharkhand State Bar Council

(Respondent-5) so that it may support all the needy regular practitioner Advocates of State of Jharkhand.

(b) Ddirection upon the Respondent(s) concerned to provide Medical Insurance Coverage to the regular practitioner Advocates of Jharkhand and their dependents or Direction to Respondent no.-2 to expand the coverage of Ayushman Bharat Health Insurance Scheme to include Advocates and their dependent family members.

(c) Direction upon the Respondent(s) concerned to provide Life Insurance to the regular practitioner Advocates of Jharkhand.”

3. Dr Neha Arora, the Executive Director of the Jharkhand State Arogya Society, Government of Jharkhand, has filed a supplementary counter-affidavit on behalf of the State of Jharkhand (Health Department) dated 17.09.2025. This affidavit was sworn by her on 10.09.2025.

4. Paragraphs 4 to 7 of the above affidavit read as follows: -

“4. That the instant affidavit is being filed in compliance with the order dated 19.11.2024 passed in the writ application, whereby the Hon'ble Court had orally directed the respondent State to file an affidavit regarding the budgetary allocation of funds for the health insurance of advocates of the State of Jharkhand. An affidavit had earlier been filed in pursuance of the said order. However, vide order dated 28.08.2025, the Hon'ble Court directed the filing of a better affidavit. Hence, in pursuance of the order dated 28.08.2025, this affidavit is being filed.

5. That it is humbly stated and submitted that a resolution dated 18.09.2024 has been taken by the State of Jharkhand wherein at point no. 8, it has been resolved that the budgetary allocation for the “Jharkhand Advocates’ Welfare Trustee Committee” has been made under the Non-Salary head.

6. That it is further stated and submitted that vide Resolution No. 13(13) dated 24.01.2025 issued by the Department of Health, Medical Education and Family Welfare, Jharkhand Government has decided that the annual premium amount of Rs. 6000/- per

registered advocate will be paid and time to time the updated premium amount will be communicated to Jharkhand Advocates' Welfare Trustee Committee.

7. That it is humbly stated and submitted that as per the present policy decision of the State Government, the policy is not limited to one year and the budgetary allocation will be done every year.

5. Mr Gaurav Raj, learned AC to AAG-II, submitted that, upon considering the statements in the above-referred affidavit, it is clear that the State has not only agreed to obtain a health insurance policy for advocates but has also made the necessary budgetary provisions under the 'Non-Salary Head'. Further, a resolution was passed on 24.01.2025 by the Department of Health, Medical Education and Family Welfare, Jharkhand Government, deciding that the annual premium of Rs. 6000/- per registered advocate will be paid, and that, from time to time, an updated premium amount will be communicated to the Jharkhand Advocates Welfare Trustee Committee. He pointed out that the affidavit clarifies that this policy of providing insurance to practising advocates is not limited to one year and that the budgetary allocation will be made every year.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the Jharkhand State Bar Council submitted that it would be better if the resolution dated 24.01.2025 is duly published in the official Gazette. They submitted that such publication in the official Gazette will prevent bureaucrats from raising frivolous objections regarding the implementation of the policy.

7. Mr Gaurav Raj submits that the affidavit filed on behalf of the State of Jharkhand is quite clear and there would be no difficulty in the implementation of the policy.

8. We accept the statements made in the affidavit filed by Dr Neha Arora on behalf of the State of Jharkhand as an undertaking on behalf of the State of Jharkhand. Similarly, we accept Mr Gaurav Raj's contentions that there would be no difficulty in implementing the policy, simply because it has not been published in the official Gazette to date.

9. Considering the statements made in the affidavit of Dr Neha Arora and the submissions made by Mr Gaurav Raj on behalf of the State of Jharkhand, we are satisfied that the reliefs prayed for in this petition stand substantially worked out. If there is any real necessity for Gazette publication, we are sure that the respondent State would ensure such publication, if such publication has not already been made, within a reasonable period. In any event, without going into the issue of Gazette publication, we have already recorded Mr Gaurav Raj's submissions that there would be no difficulty in implementing the policy on the grounds of non-publication of the resolution in the official Gazette.

10. Since the reliefs in this petition stand substantially worked out, we dispose of this petition without any order for costs.

(M.S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

June 08, 2026
Ranjeet / R.Kr.
NAFR
Uploaded on 09.06.2026