

2023 LiveLaw (SC) 768

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ABHAY S. OKA; J., PANKAJ MITHAL; J.
CIVIL APPEAL NO. 5200 OF 2023; August 25, 2023
PHOOLA RAM JAAT *versus* SANWAR SINGH**

Advocate - Professional Misconduct - Disciplinary Action against advocate who was running taxi service - The findings of the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council are based on documentary evidence - The Supreme Court found no error in the decision of BCI to bar the advocate from practice for one year.

For Appellant(s) Dr. Sushil Balwada, AOR Mr. Kaushal Yadav, Adv. Mr. Nandlal Kumar Mishra, Adv. Mr. Arjun Raghuvanshi, Adv. Dr. Ajay Kumar, Adv.

ORDER

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the appellant.
2. The Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council of India (for short, “*the Bar Council*”) has barred the appellant from practicing law for a period of one year.
3. Admittedly, the appellant was representing the complainant, his brother and mother in a civil suit. Thereafter, the appellant represented his mother in a civil suit filed by her against the complainant in respect of the same land. The appellant’s mother claimed on the basis of the agreement for sale executed by the complainant and his family members. After perusing the records, the Bar Council found that the appellant had appeared as Advocate in both the proceedings. This is one professional misconduct established against him.
4. The second allegation is of a very serious nature. The Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council found that the appellant was having a business of running taxi service. The Disciplinary Committee also found that there is striking similarity in the first name of the registered owner of the vehicle used for business and the appellant. Moreover, the name of the father of the appellant and the registered owner is the same and more importantly, the vehicle was registered at the address of the appellant.
5. The findings of the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar Council are based on documentary evidence. Therefore, we find no error in the action taken by the Disciplinary Committee when for the aforesaid misconduct, the appellant was directed not to practice law for a period of one year.
6. Hence, the appeal is dismissed.
7. Pending applications stand disposed of accordingly.

© All Rights Reserved @LiveLaw Media Pvt. Ltd.

*Disclaimer: Always check with the original copy of judgment from the Court website. Access it [here](#)