

ITEM NO.34 Court 13 (Video Conferencing)

SECTION XII

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). 13807/2019

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 06-03-2019 in WP No. 30088/2017 passed by the High Court Of Judicature At Madras)

P. MOHANASUNDARAM

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

BAR COUNCIL OF INDIA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

Date : 10-12-2021 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.R. SHAH
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. M. A. Chinnasamy, AOR
Ms. C. Rubavathi, Adv.
Mr. M. Veeraragavan, Adv.
CH. Leela Sarveswar, Adv.
Mr. V. Senthil Kumar, Adv.
Mr. P. Rajaram, Adv.
Mr. K. Ethiraj, Adv.
Mr. Kulwant Singh Narwal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. S. N. Bhat, AOR
Ms. Parvati Bhat, Adv.
Mr. D.P. Chaturvedi, Adv.

Mr. Ram Sankar, Advocate
Ms. Sujatha Bagadhi, Advocate
Ms. G. Chitrakala, Advocate
Ms. Divya, Advocate
Mr. Anirveda Sharma, Advocate
Mr. G. Jai Singh, Advocate
Mr. S. A. Manikanda Raja, Advocate
for M/S. Ram Sankar & Co, AOR

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

We have heard Mr. M.A. Chinnasamy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. S.N. Bhat, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-Bar Council of India.

Considering the fact that at the time when the petitioner submitted an application for enrolment as an Advocate, he suppressed the material fact of pending criminal case against him. It was also found that even he was continued as a partner in the Chartered Accountant Firm.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances when the petitioner was removed by the Bar Council under proviso to Section 26(1) of the Advocates Act and when the same is confirmed by the High Court it cannot be said that the High Court has committed any error.

The Special Leave Petition stands dismissed.

(R. NATARAJAN)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SUNIL KUMAR RAJVANSHI)
BRANCH OFFICER