

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 4498/2024

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 18-01-2024 in WA No. 45/2024 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad)

RANBIR SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(IA No.43875/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.43876/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 26-02-2024 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.R. GAVAI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MEHTA

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Manish Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Neelmani Guha, Adv.
Ms. Harshal Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Mangal, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Deepti Verma, Adv.
Mr. Pramod Chandra Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Arpit Shukla, AOR

For Respondent(s)

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

1. After arguing for some time, when we were inclined to dismiss the petition, Ms. Meenakshi Arora, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner, seeks permission to withdraw the petition.
2. We are not inclined to grant the permission, inasmuch as the present petition is nothing else but an abuse of process of law.
3. This special leave petition challenges the order dated 18.01.2024, vide which after finding some merit in the case of the petitioner, the learned Single Judge of the High Court has issued notice and directed the matter to be posted in the week commencing

08.04.2024.

4. It can thus be seen that there is no order passed by the High Court with which the petitioner can be said to be aggrieved. On the contrary, the order impugned herein is in favour of the petitioner inasmuch as the High Court has specifically observed that the matter requires consideration and had issued notice.

5. We have come across several such matters, wherein the special leave petitions are filed either against the order seeking adjournment or the order issuing notices or grant/refusal of interim protections.

6. As we observed in one of our orders (SLP(C) No.19043/2022 - Mohan Chandra P. v. The State Of Karnataka and Ors.) that the Advocate(s)-on-Record are not only the postmen of the litigants, they are also an officer of the Court and owe responsibility towards the system. Filing of such petitions not only wastes the time of the Court but it also puts unnecessary burden on the Courts and adds up to the pendency of matters before the Courts.

7. The designated senior counsel owe greater responsibility as an officer of the Court.

8. We, therefore, in order to send a message to the Advocate(s)-on-Record and the learned senior counsel/counsel appearing in such matters, are inclined to dismiss this petition with a token cost of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only), which shall be paid within a period of two weeks from today. Ordered accordingly.

9. Out of the said sum of Rs.1,00,000/-, Rs. 50,000/- is to be paid to the Supreme Court Bar Association, which shall be used for Library purpose and Rs.50,000/- be paid to the Supreme Court Advocates on Record Association, to be used for the purpose of advocate welfare.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(NARENDRA PRASAD)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(ANJU KAPOOR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)