

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. _____ OF 2026
[DIARY NO(S).51143/2026]

IN

WRIT PETITION(C) NO.581/2024

SWATI SINHA & ORS.

PETITIONER(S)/
APPLICANT(S)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. _____ OF 2026
[DIARY NO(S).49620/2026]

IN

WRIT PETITION(C) NO.581/2024

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. _____ OF 2026
[DIARY NO(S).51155/2026]

IN

WRIT PETITION(C) NO.581/2024

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. _____ OF 2026
[DIARY NO(S).51374/2026]

IN

WRIT PETITION(C) NO.581/2024

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. OF 2026
[DIARY NO(S).52486/2026]

IN

WRIT PETITION(C) NO.581/2024

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. OF 2026
[DIARY NO(S).49007/2026]

IN

WRIT PETITION(C) NO.581/2024

O R D E R

1. Initially, in para 6 of our order dated 08.12.2025 passed in WP (C) No. 581/2024, we directed that *"30% of the total seats in the State Bar Council shall be represented by women members of the Bar Associations. Out of these, 20% be filled up by way of election and 10% by way of co-option."*

2. In furtherance thereof, submissions were made by members of the Bar with regard to the zone of consideration for the purpose of co-option of the women members of the State Bar Councils (SBCs). On a suggestion proffered by the Court, there was broad consensus that the Chief Justices of the jurisdictional High Courts may be authorised to nominate the co-opted women members to the State Bar Councils.

3. Accordingly, the order dated 04.08.2026 was passed, containing the following directions in para 3:

"We, accordingly, direct that the two women candidates to be co-opted to the State Bar Councils shall be from the following categories:

- (i) former women Judges of the jurisdictional High Court, or
- (ii) senior women members of the Bar having fair standing and belonging to the concerned State/States/UTs."

4. The instant Miscellaneous Applications seek modification of our order dated 04.08.2026. The Applicants seek a direction that either (i) the elected members of the SBC, through a transparent, democratic process, elect the two co-opted members; or (ii) the positions earmarked for co-option be filled by the unelected women candidates, who secured the highest number of votes in the respective SBC elections. Certain concerns were also raised regarding the eligibility of women advocates to be nominated for co-option, the meaning of the term "senior", as well as the permissibility of nominating a former Judge of the respective High Court.

5. We have heard and considered all the submissions as well as suggestions made by the counsel on both sides.

6. It is already clarified in para 4 of our order dated 04.08.2026 that the women advocates, who contested the SBC elections but were unsuccessful in the same, are also eligible for nomination under the method of co-option.

7. Further, the use of the word "senior" in para 3 of the said order is not to be construed as only those persons who are designated as 'senior advocates'. Rather, it means someone who has been in practice for a substantially long period of time and is found suitable by the elected members of the SBC as well as shortlisted by the Chief Justice of the respective High Court.

8. Additionally, we do not view the bar contained in Article 220 of the Constitution against practice by former Chief Justices and Judges of the High Courts as any kind of impediment to their co-option into the respective SBC. By virtue of becoming a member of the SBCs, they are not required to resume practice before the respective High Courts.

9. Finally, it goes without saying that since the SBC of Tripura only comprises fifteen members, only one woman member would be co-opted.

10. With these clarifications, we dispose of the instant Miscellaneous Applications.

11. While doing so, we would like to reiterate that this initiative of ensuring adequate representation to women members of the Bar has occurred for the first time and is a

welcome step in our collective journey towards equal representation of women in the legal profession. While it is difficult to ensure nomination for all, we believe this court-created mechanism, guaranteeing them a place in elected offices, will encourage women lawyers to come forward and contest Bar Council elections in even greater numbers. We also believe that with the due course of time, the Parliament as well as the Executive Authorities will provide an appropriate mechanism for women representation in the various Bar Councils. Until then, the instant mechanism will continue to remain in force.

.....CJI.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

.....J.
(V. MOHANA)

NEW DELHI;
SEPTEMBER 09, 2026

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION..... Diary No(s).51143/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 04-08-2026 in W.P.(C) No.581/2024 passed by the Supreme Court of India]

SWATI SINHA & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 252735/2026 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No. 252737/2026 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No. 252728/2026 - MODIFICATION

WITH

Diary No(s). 49620/2026 (PIL-W)

IA No. 243795/2026 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No. 243803/2026 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No. 243806/2026 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No. 243798/2026 - MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDER

Diary No(s). 51155/2026 (PIL-W)

IA No. 253648/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS, IA No.253653/2026 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION

Diary No(s). 51374/2026 (PIL-W)

IA No. 253709/2026 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No. 253628/2026 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No. 253707/2026 - MODIFICATION

Diary No(s). 52486/2026 (PIL-W)

IA No. 259016/2026 - RECALLING THE COURTS ORDER

Diary No(s). 49007/2026 (PIL-W)

IA No. 240105/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

Date : 09-09-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANA

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Mehmood Pracha, Adv.
Mr. R. H. A. Sikander, AOR
Mr. Jatin Bhatt, Adv.
Mr. Sanawar, Adv.
Ms. Nujhat Naseem, Adv.
Mr. Kumail Abbas, Adv.
Mr. Adeel Hasan, Adv.

Ms. Radhika Gautam, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Parikh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Amit Srivastav, Adv.
Ms. Sanjana Srikumar, AOR
Mr. Onkar Singh, Adv.
Ms. Avni Singh, Adv.
Ms. Ragini Sachdeva, Adv.
Ms. Sanya, Adv.
Mr. Raj Narayan Pal, Adv.

Dr. Menaka Guruswamy, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Shaswati Parhi, Adv.
Ms. Bhumika Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Anmol Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Suruchi Mittal, Adv.
Ms. Anushka Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Ritika Chaudhary, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Gautam, AOR
Mr. Vikramaditya Chouhan, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Singhal, Adv.

Ms. Shobha Gupta, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Yogamaya M G, Adv.
Mr. Deepak Prakash, AOR
Ms. Mamtha Singh, Adv.
Ms. Mamta Singh, Adv.
Mr. Pratheek Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Jyoti P. Deborah, Adv.
Ms. Jyoti P Deborah, Adv.
Ms. Akansha Bhatia, Adv.
Mr. Saksham Mathur, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Parekh, Sr. Adv.
Ms. S. Lakshmi Iyer, AOR
Ms. Sakshi Jain, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Ms. Radhika Gautam, AOR

Mr. R. Venkataramani, Attorney General for India
Mr. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General
Mr. Anuj Udupa, Adv.
Mr. Aastha Singh, Adv.
Mr. Gaurang Bhushan, Adv.
Mr. P.V. Yogeshwaran, Adv.
Mr. Chitvan Singhal, Adv.
Ms. Ameyavikrama Thanvi, Adv.
Mr. Kartikay Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Raman Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Aman Mehta, Adv.

Mr. G.S. Makkar (aor), Adv.
Dr. N. Visakamurthy, AOR

Mr. Prateek Bhatia, AOR

Ms. Tatini Basu, AOR
Mr. Kumar Shashank, Adv.
Mr. Byrapaneni Suyodhan, Adv.

Mr. D Bharat Kumar, Adv.
Mr. M Chandrakanth Reddy, Adv.
Mr. Siddhartha Sinha, AOR

Mr. Yusuf, AOR
Dr. Ram Sankar, Adv.
Ms. Sujatha Bagadhi, Adv.
Mr. Naveenkumar M A, Adv.
Ms. Archana Goswami, Adv.
Mr. Vasantha Kumar K, Adv.
Mr. Tamizhendhi, Adv.

Mr. Aljo K. Joseph, AOR

Mrs. Sumita Ray, AOR
Ms. Disha Ray, Adv.
Ms. Vanshika Singh, Adv.
Mr. Piyush Wadhwa, Adv.
Ms. Vriddhi Bhatt, Adv.

Mr. Rajat Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Arvind S. Avhad, AOR

Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR
Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.
Ms. Rajkumari Divyasana, Adv.

Mr. Vikas Upadhyay, AOR

Mr. Jasbir Singh Malik, Adv.
Ms. Prachi Sohi, Adv.
Ms. Sri Pragyna A., Adv.
Mr. Varun Punia, AOR

Mr. Vivek Narayan Sharma, AOR
Mrs. Mahima Bhirdwaj Kalucha, Adv.
Mr. Akash Singh, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Kumar Narula, Adv.
Ms. Palak Kaushik, Adv.
Ms. Annika Khurana, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Dinesh Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Vikas, AOR

Ms. Filza Moonis, AOR

Applicant-in-person

Mr. Shishir Pinaki, Adv.

Mr. Dhanaeswar Gudapalli, Adv.

Mr. D. Mahesh Babu, AOR

Ms. Filza Moonis, AOR

Mr. Sriram P., AOR

Mr. Sriram Parakkat, Adv.

Mr. Anandhu S. Nair, Adv.

Mr. Abhay Jadaun, Adv.

Mr. Ramavath Balaji Naik, Adv.

Ms. Shreya Gupta, Adv.

Ms. S. Lakshmi Iyer, AOR

Mr. Sunny Kadiyan, AOR

Ms. Aagam Kaur, AOR

Mr. Biju P Raman, AOR

Ms. Rajshri Ashutosh Dubey, AOR

Mrs. Rajshri Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Ashutosh Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Chauhan, Adv.

Mr. Anjan Datta, Adv.

Mr. Amit P Shahi, Adv.

Mr. Anirban Tripathy, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Sethi, Adv.

Mrs. Rekha Chaudhary, Adv.

Mr. Govind Kashyap, Adv.

Mr. Rishabh Bhardwaj, Adv.

Mr. Lokesh Raghav, Adv.

Mr. Om Prakash Yadav, Adv.

Ms. Chand Trikha, Adv.

Mr. Hb Dubey, Adv.

Mrs. Sona Khan, Adv.

Mr. Durgesh Ramchandra Gupta, AOR

Mr. Niranjan Sahu, AOR

Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR

Ms. Gaytri Virmani, Adv.

Mr. Vairawan A.s, AOR

Mr. Pravartak Suhas Pathak, AOR

Intervenor-in-person

Ms. Nina Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Radhika Gupta, AOR

Ms. Bhumani Tyagi, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Permission to file miscellaneous applications is granted.
2. Applications for intervention/impleadment are allowed.
3. The Miscellaneous Applications are disposed of in terms of the signed order.
4. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)

ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)

DY. REGISTRAR

(signed order is placed on the file)