

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA; C U T T A C K

I.A. NO.12883 OF 2019

(Arising out of W.P.(C) No.17009 of 2019)

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application for stay / appropriate order,
filed under Chapter-VI, Rule-27 of the
Orissa High Court Rules.

A N D

IN THE MATTER OF:

Sri Banshidhar Baug.

... PETITIONER

-VERSUS-

Orissa High Court and others.

... OPPOSITE PARTIES

To

The Hon'ble Shri Justice Kalpesh Satyendra Jhaveri, B.Sc.
LL.B., the Chief Justice of the High Court of Orissa and His
Lordship's other companion of Justices of the said Hon'ble
Court.

The humble petition of the
Petitioner named above;

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:-

1. That the petitioner has filed the present writ petition
for quashing the Notification dated 19.08.2019 issued by this
Hon'ble Court on the order of the Hon'ble Chief Justice declaring
the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates. Further, the

petitioner has also challenged the inclusion of sub-rule (9) to Rule-6 of the Rules, 2019 as illegal and arbitrary and has sought for quashing the same.

2. That to avoid the risk of repetition and for brevity of this application, the averments made in the writ petition may kindly be considered as part and parcel of this application for stay.

3. That the petitioner has fair chance of success in the writ petition.

4. That unless the operation of the impugned Notification No.1378 dated 19.08.2019 (Annexure-8) issued by this Hon'ble Court is stayed during pendency of the present writ petition, the petitioner will be highly prejudiced.

5. That this Interim Application is bonafide.

P R A Y E R

Under the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Hon'ble Court may be graciously pleased to allow this application and thereafter be further pleased to direct stay of operation of the impugned Notification No.1378 dated 19.08.2019 (Annexure-8) to the writ petition during pendency of the writ petition before this Hon'ble Court.

And for this act of your kindness, the Petitioner shall remain ever pray.

Cuttack

By the Petitioner

Date:- 16.09.2019

A F F I D A V I T

I,

do hereby solemnly affirm
and state as follows :-

- (i) That I am the petitioner in the present case.
- (ii) That the facts stated in this Interim Application are true to the best of my knowledge.

DEPONENT

C E R T I F I C A T E

Certified that due to the non-availability of cartridge papers, these thick blue papers have been used.

By the petitioner

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA; C U T T A C K

(ORIGINAL JURISDICTION CASE)

W.P.(C) NO.17009 OF 2019

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India.

A N D

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application under the High Court of
Orissa (Designation of Senior Advocate)
Rules, 2019.

A N D

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application under the Advocates Act,
1961.

A N D

IN THE MATTER OF:

An application challenging the arbitrary
and illegal action of the Full Court of Orissa
High Court and the Hon'ble Chief Justice
declaring the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as
Senior Advocates in contravention of High
Court of Orissa (Designation of Senior
Advocate) Rules, 2019.

A N D

IN THE MATTER OF:

... PETITIONER

-VERSUS-

1. Orissa High Court, represented through its Registrar General, At/P.O- Chandinichowk, P.S.- Lalbag, Town/District- Cuttack.
2. The Hon'ble Chief Justice of Orissa High Court, At/P.O.- Chandinchowk, Town/Dist – Cuttack.
3. Registrar (Judicial), Orissa High Court, At/P.O- Chandinichowk, P.S.- Lalbag, Town/District- Cuttack.
4. Permanent Committee for Designation of Senior Advocates of Orissa High Court, represented through its Secretary, At – High Court of Orissa, P.O- Chandinichowk, P.S.- Lalbag, Town/District- Cuttack.
- 5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

... **OPPOSITE PARTIES.**

The matter out of which this writ petition arises was never before this Hon'ble Court in any other form, as per the instruction of the Petitioners.

To

The Hon'ble Shri Justice Kalpesh Satyendra Jhaveri, B.Sc. LL.B., the Chief Justice of the High Court of Orissa and His Lordship's other companion of Justices of the said Hon'ble Court.

The humble petition of the
Petitioners named above;

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:-

1. That the petitioner is a citizen of India and a Practicing Advocate in this Hon'ble Court. The cause of action for the present writ petition arose at Cuttack which is within the territorial jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court.

2. That the petitioner in this writ petition challenges the illegal and arbitrary action of the Opposite parties in designating the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates vide Notification dated 19.08.2019 which is in complete contravention of the High Court of Orissa (Designation of Senior Advocate) Rules, 2019. Further, the petitioner also challenges the inclusion of sub-rule (9) of Rule-6 in the High Court of Orissa (Designation of Senior Advocate) Rules, 2019 as illegal and arbitrary. Hence, the petitioner seeks issuance of appropriate direction and/or writ for quashing the designation of Senior Advocates of the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 and sub-rule (9) of Rule-6 of the High Court of Orissa (Designation of Senior Advocate) Rules, 2019.

3. That the petitioner is a practicing Advocate in this Hon'ble Court. The petitioner's Odisha State Bar Council Enrolment Number is the petitioner has completed more than 38 years of practice before

this Hon'ble Court. The petitioner is also practicing in the Civil Courts and Criminal Courts of Cuttack as well as at Bhubaneswar.

4. That Section 16 of the Advocates Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") gives authority / power to the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as to the High Courts of the Country to designate an Advocate as Senior Advocate if the Hon'ble Apex Court or the concerned High Court, as the case may be, is of opinion that by virtue of his ability and standing at the Bar or special knowledge or experience in law he is deserving to be designated as Senior Advocate.

5. That on 13.06.2011 this Hon'ble Court published a Notification crystallizing procedure to designate an Advocate as Senior Advocate which contains three Rules only and those are quoted below:-

- “1. The advocate seeking consideration shall not be less than 35 years of age of the time of moving an application and he must have an experience which is not less than 10 years at the Bar. The services rendered by the advocate at the State Judicial Services will also be considered.
2. The advocate must have a net annual taxable income which is not less than three lakh rupees.
3. The Full Court shall consider the application and designation is conferred upon advocates who secure a simple majority of votes. The advocates rejected by the High Court will not be considered for a subsequent period of one year.”

6. That the petitioner sometimes in 2013-14 applied for being designated as Senior Advocate as per the guidelines of the Rules of 2011 published on 13.06.2011. While the matter was pending for consideration, this Hon'ble Court in pursuance of the direction issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Indira Jaising vrs. Supreme Court of India through Secretary General and others, reported in **(2017) 9 SCC 766**, framed the Rule called as "the High Court of Orissa (Designation of Senior Advocate) Rules, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as "the Rules, 2019"). In the said Rules, 2019, the detailed procedures have been prescribed for application by the intending Advocates and proposals given by the Hon'ble Judges and the Hon'ble Chief Justice for designating a particular Advocate as Senior Advocate. Although in the direction issued giving guidelines for framing of the Rules as contemplated in paragraphs-73 to 73.11, but this Hon'ble Court included in the Rule sub-rule (9) in Rule-6 in complete contravention of the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforesaid case which is binding on this Hon'ble Court.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of the judgment in Indira Jaising case, reported in (2017) 9 SCC 766 is annexed herewith as **Annexure-1** and the Rules, 2019 framed by this Hon'ble Court is annexed herewith as **Annexure-2**.

7. That as per the said Rules, there shall be a Permanent Committee consisting of the Chief Justice, two Senior Most Judges

of the High Court, the Advocates General of the State of Orissa and a designated Senior Advocate of the Bar to be nominated by the Members of the Committee.

As per sub-rule (2) of Rule-3 of the Rules, 2019, the Committee constituted under sub-rule (1) shall have a Secretariat, the composition of which will be decided by the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the High Court in consultation with the other Members of the Committee.

Rule-4 of the Rules 2019 prescribes eligibility criteria of an Advocate being designated as Senior Advocate.

Rule-5 prescribes the mode / motion for designation of Senior Advocates. Clause (a) of Sub-rule (1) of Rule-5 speaks that the Hon'ble Chief Justice or any sitting Judge of the High Court of Orissa may propose an Advocate to be designated as Senior Advocate with the written consent of the Advocate concerned. Sub-rule (2) of Rule-5 speaks that an Advocate intending to be designated as Senior Advocate may apply in the prescribed format for being designated as Senior Advocate. Rule-6 prescribes the procedure for designation of Senior Advocate. Sub-rule (1) of Rule-6 speaks that all written proposals or application for designation of an Advocate as Senior Advocate shall be submitted to the Secretariat. Sub-rule (2) of Rule-6 speaks that on receipt of the application or proposal for designation of an Advocate as Senior Advocate, the Secretariat shall comply the relevant date and the information with regard to the reputation, conduct, integrity of the Advocate concerned and on the matters covered under Sl. Nos.2

and 3 of the Appendix “B” covering a period of last five years. Sub-rule (3) of Rule-6 speaks that the Secretariat will notify the proposed names of the Advocate to be designated as Senior Advocate on the official website of the High Court of Orissa inviting suggestion and views within such time as may be fixed by the Committee. Sub-rule (4) of Rule-6 speaks that after compliance of sub-rule (3), the Secretariat shall put up the case before the Committee for scrutiny and sub-rule (5) thereof speaks that after submission of the case by the Secretariat, the Committee shall examine the same in the light of the material provided and if so desire, may also interact with the concerned Advocate(s) and thereafter will make its overall assessment on the basis of the point based in format provided in Appendix ‘B’ to the Rules. As per sub-rule (6) of Rule-6, after overall assessment by the Committee, all the names registered before it will be submitted to the Full Court along with its assessment report. Thereafter, as per sub-rule (7) of Rule-6, the Full Court will decide to designate an Advocate as Senior Advocate. Sub-rule (8) of Rule-6 prescribes that the Full Court may review or reconsider after expiry of two years the proposals which have not been favourably considered. Sub-rule (9) of Rule-6 which is most important, gives suo-motu power to the Full Court to designate an Advocate as Senior Advocate if the Full Court is of the opinion that by virtue of his/her ability or standing at the Bar, the said Advocate deserves such designation.

It is humbly stated that this sub-rule (9) of Rule – 6 is contrary to the guidelines issued by this Hon'ble Court in Indira Jaising's case. This sub-rule (9) of Rule-6 was not there in the guidelines issued by this Hon'ble Court in Indira Jaising's case in paragraph-73 to 73.11.

Rule-7 prescribes designation of Advocate as Senior Advocate by the Hon'ble Chief Justice. Sub-rule (1) thereof speaks that on the approval of the names by the Full Court, the Chief Justice shall designate such an Advocate as Senior Advocate under Section 16 of the Advocates Act, 1961. Sub-rule (2) of Rule – 7 of the rules prescribes that the Registrar General shall notify the said designation to the Secretary General of the Supreme Court of India, Registrar General of other High Courts, the Bar Council of Orissa, Bar Council of India and also to all District and Sessions Judges and subordinate to the High Court of Orissa. Sub-rule (3) of the said Rules prescribes that record of the proceeding of the Committee and the record received from the Full Court in this regard shall be maintained by the Permanent Secretariat for further reference.

8. That after the Rules, 2019 came into force, the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble Court constituted the Permanent Committee consisting of the Hon'ble Chief Justice himself, two Senior Most Judges, the Advocate General of Odisha and one Senior Advocate, namely, Sri Bijoya Krushna Mohanty.

9. That after constitution of the Permanent Committee, this Hon'ble Court through its Registrar (Judicial) vide Advertisement No.1 dated 22.04.2019 called for applications from eligible intending candidates for applying for being designated as Senior Advocates as per the format (Form No.2 of Appendix 'A' appended) to the Rules, 2019.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of the Advertisement No.1 dated 22.04.2019 is annexed herewith as **Annexure-3.**

10. That after framing of the Rules, 2019 and issuance of the Advertisement No.1 dated 22.04.2019 vide Annexure-3, the Special Officer (Special Cell) of this Hon'ble Court directed the petitioner to re-submit a fresh application for being designated as Senior Advocate as per Advertisement No.1 dated 22.04.2019.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of the letter dated 22.04.2019 of the Special Officer (Special Cell) of this Hon'ble Court to the petitioner is annexed herewith as **Annexure-4.**

11. That in pursuance of the letter dated 22.04.2019 issued by the Special Officer (Special Cell) of this Hon'ble Court, the petitioner in the prescribed format applied for being designated as Senior Advocate on dated 22.05.2019.

12. That the petitioner understands which he verily believes to be true that along with other Advocates, the present Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 also applied for being designated as Senior Advocates as per the Rules, 2019.

13. That there were defects in the application filed by different advocates in their application including the petitioner and the present Opposite Party Nos.5 & 7. In order to remove the defects the permanent Committee through the Registrar (Judicial) by notice dated 01.07.2019 directed the concerned applicant-advocates to rectify the defects/wanting in their respective applications. Notice was issued to 38 applicant-advocates to rectify the wanting by 31.07.2019. In the said notice dated 31.07.2019 the names of the present petitioner was also there, so also the names of Opposite Party Nos.5 and 7 were also there. In the said notice dated 31.07.2019, the names of Sri Gautam Mukherji, Advocate and Sri Durga Prasad Nanda, Advocate find place at Sl. No.1 & 10 respectively. This shows that like the present petitioner and others the Opposite Party Nos.5 and 7 also applied for being designated as Senior Advocates as per the Rules, 2019 and the same after being scrutinized by the Secretariat of the Permanent Committee notice was issued on 01.07.2019 for rectification of the wanting in the applications.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of

the notice dated 01.07.2019 issued by this Hon'ble Court through the Registrar (Judicial) is annexed herewith as **Annexure-5**.

14. That after the notice dated 01.07.2019 as aforesaid, the present petitioner was also noticed by the Special Officer (Special Cell) of this Hon'ble Court on 02.07.2019 to furnish the required documents, i.e., the declaration as per advertisement. The petitioner understands that similar notice was also issued by the Special Officer (Special Cell) to the Opposite Party Nos.5 and 7 to rectify the wanting in their applications.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of the notice dated 02.07.2019 issued by the Special Officer (Special Cell) to the present petitioner is annexed herewith as **Annexure-6**.

15. That while the matter stood thus and before compliance of the sub-rule (3) of Rule-6, the Permanent Committee for designation of Advocates as Senior Advocates on 08.08.2019 recommended the names of certain Advocates i.e. the names of the opposite party No.5 to 9 for being designated as Senior Advocates which will be evident from Item No.1 of the Minutes of the Permanent Committee dated 08.08.2019.

16. That on the next day, i.e., on 09.08.2019, as per Rule-6(3) of the Rules, 2019, the Registrar (Judicial) of the Orissa High Court issued notice inviting suggestions and views, if any, against

the present petitioner as well as some other Applicant-Advocates in total numbering 45. In those 45 names, the name of the petitioner finds place, whereas the name of the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 does not find place at all. The last date for receiving the suggestion and views as per the notice dated 09.08.2019 was fixed to 08.09.2019.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of the notice dated 09.08.2019 is annexed herewith **Annexure-7**.

17. That while the matter stood thus, awaiting the views and proposals as per notice dated 09.08.2019 vide Annexure-7, the Full Court meeting of this Hon'ble Court was held on 17.08.2019 and in the said Full Court meeting, along with other Agendas one Agenda was with regard to the; Application received from Sri P.K. Ray, Advocate for being considered as a Senior Advocate and the other Agenda was; Minutes of the Permanent Committee for designation of Advocates as Senior Advocates held on 08.08.2019 at Item No.1 in recommending the names of Advocates for being designated as Senior Advocates.

It is humbly stated and submitted that in the Full Court meeting of this Hon'ble Court dated 17.08.2019, the Full Court of this Hon'ble Court illegally and arbitrarily approved and/or recommended the names of the present Opposite Party

Nos.5 to 9 to be designated as Senior Advocates violating the Rules, 2019.

18. That after the Full Court approval as aforesaid, the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble Court has been pleased to designate the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates and the same has been notified by the Registrar General of this Hon'ble Court vide Notification No.1378 dated 19.08.2019 on the order of the Hon'ble Chief Justice.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of the Notification dated 19.08.2019 is annexed herewith as **Annexure-8**.

19. That it is pertinent to state and mention here that while the notice inviting proposals and views are pending as per notice dated 09.08.2019, this Hon'ble Court through the Registrar (Judicial) has been pleased to issue Advertisement No.2 dated 04.09.2019 inviting once again applications from intending eligible Advocates in the prescribed format for being designated as Senior Advocates.

For kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court, a true copy of the said Advertisement No.2 dated 04.09.2019 is annexed herewith as **Annexure-9**.

20. That the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 have been declared as Senior Advocates by the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble Court on the approval thereof by the Full Court, which is completely illegal and arbitrary since the same is completely contrary to the Rules, 2019. By the said illegal act, the present petitioner, who is much more senior than the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 has been illegally ignored and discriminated and by the process the petitioner has been mentally humiliated. Thus, the fundamental rights of the petitioner to be considered along with the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 have been violated which is guaranteed under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

21. That being aggrieved by the Full Court approval and order of the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble Court issuing Notification No.1378 dated 19.08.2019 declaring the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates, the petitioner has no other speedy, alternative and efficacious remedy other than to challenge the same by invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and hence the present writ petition which is bonafide.

22. That the order of the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble Court directing issue of notification dated 19.08.2019 declaring the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates is illegal and arbitrary and the same is liable to be quashed.

22. That the decision of the Full Court and order of the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble Court declaring the above five Advocates, i.e., Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates being contrary to the Rules, 2019, the same is illegal and without jurisdiction and hence the same is liable to be quashed.

23. That when the names of the aforesaid five Advocates rooted through Rule-5 of the Rules and were placed before the Permanent Committee of this Hon'ble Court constituted under sub-rule (1) and (2) of Rule-6 of the Rules, 2019, without following the procedure under sub-rule (3) of Rule-6 under no circumstances they could have been either considered by the Permanent Committee as held in their meeting dated 08.08.2019 nor the Full Court should have approved their names for being designated as Senior Advocates by-passing sub-rule (3) of Rule-6 and further without following the procedure as contemplated under sub-rule (5) of Rule-6 and Appendix 'B' attached thereto.

24. That the Agenda of the Full Court of this Hon'ble Court dated 17.08.2019 clearly shows that the names of Advocates, i.e., the names of the present Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 were recommended by the Permanent Committee for being designated as Senior Advocates by-passing sub-rule (3), (4) and (5) of the Rule-6 of the Rules, 2019. Hence, the impugned notification issued by the Registrar General on the order of the Hon'ble Chief Justice on dated 19.08.2019 is liable to be quashed.

25. That unless and until the names of those five learned Advocates are either proposed by the Hon'ble Chief Justice or by any other Hon'ble Judges of this Hon'ble Court or rooted through applications, their names should not have come to the Permanent Committee at all. From the Agenda of this Hon'ble Court dated 17.08.2019 it is clear that in Item No.1 of the minutes of the meeting dated 08.08.2019 the Permanent Committee has recommended their names for being designated as Senior Advocates which are completely contrary to the Rules, 2019.

26. That the Rules, 2019 has been framed as per the direction and/or guidelines issued in the Indira Jaising's case. But, this Hon'ble Court contrary to the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Indira Jaising's case, has arbitrarily inserted sub-rule (9) in Rule-6 of the Rules, 2019. The said obstinate clause i.e., sub-rule (9) of Rule-6 of the Rules 2019 gives suo-motu power to the Full Court for declaring an Advocate as Senior Advocate without following the procedure laid down in Rule-3 to Rule-6(6) of the Rules, 2019. The very inclusion of sub-rule (9) to Rule-6 of the Rules being contrary to the guidelines in Indira Jaising's case and further the same being intended for arbitrary exercise of power, the said sub-rule (9) of Rule-6 of the Rules, 2019 is liable to be quashed.

27. That it is well settled principle of law that when a provision of law or Rule prescribes certain thing to be done in a

particular way, the same should be done in that way or not at all. Anything done contrary to the Rule becomes illegal.

28. That when the names of 45 Applicant-Advocates were notified on 09.08.2019 inviting views and proposals, there is no reason as to why instead of notifying the names of the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 inviting views and proposals as per the Rules, they have been declared Senior Advocates. Hence, the said declaration being illegal and arbitrary, the same is liable to be quashed.

29. That the action of the Full Court of this Hon'ble Court is otherwise illegal as because during pendency of the notice dated 09.08.2019 inviting suggestions and views within 08.09.2019, this Hon'ble Court has declared the opposite party No.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates.

30. That neither the Permanent Committee nor the Full Court has taken any exception to the fact that Bibeka Nanda Mohanty has never appeared nor argued in any case at least within 10 to 15 years from today and further his father – Shri Bijoya Krushna Mohanty, Senior Advocate is a member of the Permanent Committee.

31. That the action of the Permanent Committee as well as the Full Court and so also the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this

Hon'ble Court have made discrimination without any basis among the Advocates who have applied for being designated as Senior Advocates.

32. That when the opposite party No's.5 to 9 applied by filing applications as per Rules, 2019 for being designated as Senior Advocates, they can never be considered under Rule – 9 (6) of the Rules, 2019 for being designated as Senior Advocates.

33. That the declaration of the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates by the Hon'ble Chief Justice by Notification dated 19.08.2019 being otherwise illegal and arbitrary, the same is liable to be quashed. Further, the inclusion of sub-rule (9) in Rule-6 of the Rules, 2019 being contrary to the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the Indira Jaising's case and being intended to be misused arbitrarily, the same is also liable to be struck down / quashed from the Rules, 2019.

34. That since the Hon'ble Chief Justice of this Hon'ble Court has been pleased to declare the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates and has issued the Notification dated 19.08.2019 vide Annexure-8, the petitioner has impleaded the Hon'ble Chief Justice as an Opposite Party in the present writ petition.

35. That the writ petition is moved bonafide and in the interest of justice.

P R A Y E R

Under the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be graciously pleased to admit this writ petition and issue a 'Rule-Nisi' calling upon the Opposite Parties to show cause as to why;

- (i) the Notification No.1378 dated 19.08.2019 vide Annexure-8 declaring the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 as Senior Advocates shall not be quashed;
- (ii) the sub-rule (9) of Rule-6 of the Rules, 2019 shall not be quashed; and
- (iii) to direct the Permanent Committee as well as the Full Court of this Hon'ble Court to consider the application of the Opposite Party Nos.5 to 9 along with 45 applicants named in the Notice dated 09.08.2019 vide Annexure-7 for being designated as Senior Advocates;

A N D

If the opposite parties or anyone of them fail to show-cause or show insufficient cause make the said rule absolute.

A N D

Pass such other order/orders and/or writ/writs as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.

And for this act of your kindness, the petitioner shall ever pray.

Cuttack

By the petitioner

Date:- 16.09.2019

A F F I D A V I T

I,

do hereby solemnly affirm

and state as follows :-

- (i) That I am the petitioner in the present writ petition.
- (ii) That the facts stated in this writ petition are true to the best of my knowledge.

DEPONENT

C E R T I F I C A T E

Certified that due to the non-availability of cartridge papers, these thick blue papers have been used.

By the Petitioner