

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 7627 of 2025**

=====

ASHOK BHANUSHANKAR TRIVEDI & ORS.

Versus

THE STATE OF GUJARAT & ORS.

=====

Appearance:

MR DEEP D VYAS(3869) for the Petitioner(s) No. 1,2,3

MR GH VIRK, GOVERNMENT PLEADER with MS DHARITRI PANCHOLI,

AGP for the Respondent(s) No. 1,2,5

MR PREMAL R JOSHI(1327) for the Respondent(s) No. 3

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NIKHIL S. KARIEL**Date : 07/08/2025****ORAL ORDER**

1. Heard learned Senior Advocate Mr.Gautam Joshi with learned advocate Mr.Deep D. Vyas on behalf of the petitioners, learned Government Pleader Mr.G.H.Virk with learned Assistant Government Pleader Ms.Dharitri Pancholi on behalf of the respondent - State and learned Advocate Mr.Premal Joshi appearing on behalf of respondent no.3 - GPSC.

2. At the outset, learned Senior Advocate Mr.Joshi would tender an affidavit by the petitioner no.1 herein whereby, the petitioners have sought to unconditionally withdraw the writ petition.

3. The request made by learned Senior Advocate Mr.Joshi is opposed by learned Government Pleader Mr.Virk more particularly learned Government Pleader drawing attention of this Court to an affidavit-in-reply on behalf of the State whereby it is attempted to be pointed out that the present petition is not a one off attempt by the petitioners to browbeat the Presiding Officers and whereas, as per the affidavit, the petitioner is consistently attempting to browbeat the Presiding Officers and whereas, certain instances are also clearly mentioned.

4. Considering the fact that the issue in question is not restricted to the petitioners alone, since to this Court, it would appear that such petition where persons practicing before particular Presiding Officer seek to approach the High Court questioning their appointment etc. making certain allegations more particularly where such appointment has been upheld by this Court, would be nothing but an attempt by the petitioners to pressurize, browbeat and to blackmail the Presiding Officers into submission. Permitting such petitioners to withdraw the petition, to this Court, would send out wrong signals to the entire lower judiciary and whereas, this Court

exercising supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, would be loath to permit withdrawal of the petition. Hence, request made by learned Senior Advocate for permission to withdraw, is rejected.

4.1. At this stage, learned Senior Advocate would submit that his engagement in the petition was restricted insofar as making request for permission to withdraw the present petition and whereas, since this Court has refused such a request, he would no longer appearing in the petition.

5. Learned advocate Mr.Deep Vyas, at this stage, would submit that since affidavit-in-reply has been served upon him yesterday, he would require some time to take instruction as to whether a rejoinder would be required or not.

6. Considering such a request, list this matter on 14.08.2025. Rejoinder, if any, shall be filed on or before 13.08.2025.

Bhoomi

(NIKHIL S. KARIEL,J)