

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). 126/2020

MANGLESH KUMAR CHOUBEY & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

HONBLE HIGH COURT OF DELHI THROUGH ITS REGISTRAR GENERAL & ANR.
Respondent(s)
(FOR ADMISSION and IA No.9757/2020-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

Date : 31-01-2020 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE R. BANUMATHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. BOPANNAFor Petitioner(s) Mr. Govind Narayan Kaushik, Adv.
Ms. Neha Dutt Sharma, Adv.
Mr. V. Sushant, Adv.
Mr. Narender Kumar Verma, AORFor Respondent(s) Mr. A.D.N. Rao, AOR
Mr. Annam Venkatesh, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Mishra, Adv.
Mrs. Sangeetha, Adv.
Ms. Avni Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Ananya Khandelwal, Adv.UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The petitioners are the serving Judicial Officers challenging the validity of Rule 9(2) and Rule 7(c) of the Delhi Higher Judicial Service Rules, 1970 which stipulates that for competing in the higher judicial service, the candidate should have practiced as an advocate for seven years.

We are not inclined to entertain the writ petition. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. It is noticed that the issue has been considered by the larger Bench and the matter has been reserved for orders.

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

(MADHU BALA)
COURT MASTER (SH)(BEENA JOLLY)
BRANCH OFFICER