




IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:038020-DB



Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No. 62 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.03.2025

Tushar Tanwar

.....Petitioner

versus

Bar Council of India

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL, JUDGE

Present : Mr. Tushar Tanwar-petitioner in person.

Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, Advocate, for respondent-BCI.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

This petition has been filed by the petitioner as a Public Interest

Litigation praying for the following reliefs:-

- i) *Civil Writ petition in the nature of public interest litigation filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of Writ/Order/Direction in the nature of mandamus declaring that the fee charged by the BCI (respondent) on account of application fees for AIBE of Rs.3500/- plus other incidental charges from General/OBC candidates and Rs.2500/- plus other incidental charges from SC/ST candidates violates section 24(1)(f) of the Advocates Act, 1961 and infringes Article 19(1)(g) and Article 14 of the Constitution of India and is against the judgment of the Apex Court in W.P. (C) No. 352/2023.*
- ii) *Writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to show as to how the fee is being collected in the form of AIBE as it is unreasonable, infringes Article 19(1)(g), arbitrary and contrary to the judgment of the Apex Court in W.P. (C)-352/2023, or*
- iii) *Writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to not collect an amount which is in excess of what section 24(1)(f) of the Advocates Act stipulate or,*



Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No. 62 of 2025 (O&M)

[2]

- iv) Writ/order/direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent to act upon the representation of the petitioner dated 02.03.2025; or
- v) Any other appropriate writ/order/direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case."

2. The essential grievance of the petitioner is that a separate fee for examination is being charged by the Bar Council of India of Rs.3500/- besides registration fee. It is submitted that there is no enabling provision under the statute to empower the Bar Council of India to charge examination fee for All India Bar Examination (AIBE).

3. The petitioner, who is a practicing lawyer, has made a representation in this regard before the respondent-Bar Council of India vide Annexure P-5, which has not been considered as yet.

4. This Court declines interference at this stage on the merits of the matter and directs the respondent-Bar Council of India to consider and decide the representation (Annexure P-5) made by the petitioner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and pass a speaking order thereon.

5. With these observations, the petition stands disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

20.03.2025

ravinder

Whether speaking/reasoned	√Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No√