

ITEM NO.24

COURT NO.9

SECTION PIL-W

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No.16629/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 30-07-2024
in W.P.(C) No. No. 352/2023 passed by the Supreme Court of India]

K. L. J. A. KIRAN BABU

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

KARNATAKA STATE BAR COUNCIL REPRESENTED
BY RAMESH S NAIK (FDA)

Respondent(s)

IA No. 113128/2025 - PERMISSION TO APPEAR AND ARGUE IN PERSON

Date : 15-07-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) : Petitioner-in-person

For Respondent(s) :

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

1. The petitioner appearing in person has moved this Contempt Petition bringing to our notice that the directions issued by this Court in the case of "Gaurav Kumar vs. Union of India & Ors." i.e. Writ Petition (C) No. 352 of 2023 are not being complied with by the Bar Council of India and Bar Councils of various State.
2. In the main matter, this Court issued the following directions:-

*"a. The SBCs cannot charge "enrolment fees" beyond the express legal stipulation under Section 24(1)(f) as it currently stands;
b. Section 24(1)(f) specifically lays down the fiscal pre-conditions subject to which an advocate can be enrolled on State rolls. The SBCs and the BCI cannot demand payment of fees other than the stipulated enrolment fee and stamp duty, if any, as a pre-condition to enrolment;
c. The decision of the SBCs to charge fees and charges at the time of enrolment in excess of the legal stipulation under Section 24(1)(f) violates Article 14 and Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution; and
d. This decision will have prospective effect. The SBCs are not required to refund the excess enrolment fees collected before the date of this judgment."*

3. We called upon the petitioner to make us understand in what capacity he has moved this contempt petition. Indisputably, he is not one of the aggrieved persons. However, according to him any person can move a contempt petition in public interest. We do not want to get into this debate.

4. For the present, we are not inclined to issue notice, however, we would like to know from the Bar Council of India whether the directions issued in the main judgment i.e. para 109 are being complied with in their letter and spirit or not.

5. We request Mr. Manan Mishra, the learned counsel, who also happens to be the Chairman of the Bar Council of India to appear in this matter and assist us.

6. Registry shall provide one set of the entire paper book to Mr. Manan Mishra at the earliest.

7. List the matter on 04.08.2025.

(CHANDRESH)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)