

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGSWrit Petition(s) (Civil) No(s). 1040/2026

MIHIRA SOOD & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE BAR COUNCIL OF INDIA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

Date : 03-09-2026 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANAFor Petitioner(s) : Mr. K. Parameshwar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prasad Hegde, Adv.
Ms. Shabnam, Adv.
Mr. Firoz Khan, Adv.
Ms. Rupali Francesca Samuel, AORFor Respondent(s) : Mr. Talha Abdul Rahman, AOR
Mr. Sudhanshu Tewari, Adv.
Mr. Faizan Ahmed, Adv.
Ms. Vibha Swaminathan, Adv.Mr. Manan Kumar Mishra, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Radhika Gautam, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. A communication dated 13.08.2026 (First Letter) was issued by the Bar Council of India (BCI) to the Vice-Chancellor, NALSAR University of Law, Hyderabad (University), which was also addressed to all the State Bar Councils, recommending that certain penal action be taken against the University's students from the batch passing out in 2026. That was followed by another letter also dated 13.08.2026 (Second Letter), whereby the First Letter was modified, and only a limited direction to the University was issued. These

communications are the genesis of the present controversy.

2. Thereafter, it appears that both the letters were withdrawn forthwith within a few hours.

3. As the said communications were, meanwhile, challenged before this Court through the instant petition, vide order dated 14.08.2026, this Court issued notice to the BCI and the University, along with a direction that no punitive action shall be taken against the students or faculty of the University at the instance of the BCI or any State Bar Council.

4. Mr. Manan Kumar Mishra, learned senior counsel and the Chairman of the BCI, is present in person and states that all the offending communications have been withdrawn, and, as such, the matter does not survive for adjudication.

5. Mr. K. Parameshwar, learned senior counsel for the Petitioners, who are alumni of the University, however, submits, and rightly so, that the original action was without jurisdiction.

6. On an in-depth consideration of the issue, we are of the clear opinion that the Advocates Act, 1961, under which the BCI has been statutorily created, does not confer any express or implied power upon the said Council or any State Bar Council to take any penal or punitive action against students of law. Such powers must be preceded by the registration of a law graduate as an advocate under the said Act. So far as the students are concerned, it is their parent institution or the authority prescribed under the regulations/bye-laws of such institution which alone would be competent to take disciplinary action, if so required, against them.

7. Having held so, we declare both, the First Letter and the Second Letter, to be without any authority of law. The interim directions issued on 14.08.2026, thus, are made absolute.

8. The Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed of with pending application(s), if any.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DY. REGISTRAR