



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 4744/2025
CNR: RJHC010537972025 | URN: CRLMP / 8330U / 2025

Surendra Singh S/o Pusa Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Rasal,
Maulasar District Didwana Kuchaman, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Amra Ram S/o Ramu Ram, R/o Tehsil Ke Piche, Makrana
District Didwana, Kuchaman, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Vinod Choudhary Mr. Tej Singh Badgurjar
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vikram Singh Rajpurohit, PP Mr. Ramprakash Dudi, for complainant

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHIRANIA

Order

25/08/2026

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 528 BNSS for quashing of the impugned FIR No.180/2025 dated 31.05.2025 registered at Police Station Makrana, District Didwana-Kuchaman for offence under Section 319(2) of BNSS, 2023.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has not committed any offence as alleged in the impugned FIR. He further stated that he has never presented himself to be an Advocate and has not performed any work which only an Advocate can do in the Court. He justified his complete act by way of raising various arguments before this Court. However, after arguing for some time, he made a prayer that he wants to withdraw the present petition, which this Court did not permit.



3. At the time of hearing of the present petition, this Court sought the assistance of learned Senior Advocate Mr. Anand Purohit, who is also a former President of Bar Association, to hear the versions of learned counsel appearing for both the parties and to inform the Court regarding the correct facts. After lunch, when the matter was taken up again, learned senior counsel Mr. Anand Purohit, informed the Court that after hearing versions of both the counsels, he also wants that the present petition deserves to be dismissed with costs.

4. Noticing the above facts and hearing learned counsel as well as upon perusing the contents of the FIR, this Court finds that the petitioner, who is not an advocate, had represented himself before the trial Court in certain matters as an advocate and had also filed various documents in different cases. This conduct brought to the notice of concerned Courts, however, on one occasion, when he was appearing before one of the Court below, the advocates tried to apprehend him, but he managed to escape by scaling the wall of Court premises. Thereafter, the impugned FIR came to be registered against him.

5. No person can be permitted to practise as an Advocate or represent himself as an advocate unless until he is duly enrolled with the respective Bar Council of State in accordance with the provisions of the Advocates Act, 1961. So far as the present case is concerned, upon noticing the observations made by this Court, the learned counsel for the petitioner made prayer seeking withdrawal of the present petition. The said conduct further affirms the allegations made in the impugned FIR.



6. In view of the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to exercise its power under Section 528 BNSS. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed with costs of Rs. 50,000/- (rupees Fifty thousand only). The petitioner is directed to deposit the said amount within a period of one month in the Rajasthan High Court Advocate Clerks Association (Account No.51532011003861, IFSC Code PUNB0515310, Branch Office, Collectorate, Jodhpur).

7. List this case for compliance on 06.10.2026.

(RAVI CHIRANIA),J

105/Anil Kumar Choudhary